

# THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE



# **Illinois Catholic Historical Review**

---

VOLUME XI

JULY, 1928

---

NUMBER 1

## **ARCHBISHOP PETER RICHARD KENRICK AND THE VATICAN COUNCIL**

### **FOREWORD**

The following article by our collaborator, the Rev. John Rothensteiner, will form three chapters of the forthcoming History of the Archdiocese of St. Louis. Father Rothensteiner has devoted more than three years of intensive research work and composition to this, the first general account of the origin and the development of the church in the Mississippi Valley. The reverend historian has worked up a vast amount of historical material on a really original plan, which enabled him to maintain unity and diversity. The history will comprise at least one thousand pages; and will probably be bound in two volumes. The date set for publication is some time in December.

THE EDITOR.

Among the heroic prelates that laid the Church's foundation deep and strong in the virgin soil of America, the great Archbishop of St. Louis, Peter Richard Kenrick, must be numbered as one of the greatest and best. He stands in line with John Carroll of Baltimore, John England of Charleston, John Hughes of New York, and his own brother, Francis Patrick of Philadelphia and Baltimore. At one time he held spiritual authority over the churches in Missouri, Arkansas, western Illinois and the Indian Territory as far as the Rocky Mountains. Personally he was gifted with keen intellect and tenacious memory, singular power of leadership and organization, unstudied eloquence, and deep piety. In the Councils of the American Church he

stood as the intellectual leader, *primus inter pares*. In the vast extent of his diocese and archdiocese, the imprint of his personal character is noticeable everywhere. Any act of such a man should, therefore, command respectful attention, especially if that act be of such universal importance and interest as that proposed in our present theme: Archbishop Peter Richard Kenrick and the Vatican Council.

### I. ARCHBISHOP KENRICK VISITS ROME

The close of the year 1866, November 30, marked an epoch in Archbishop Kenrick's life. On that very day, the Feast of St. Andrew, twenty-five years ago, he had received episcopal consecration in Philadelphia at the hands of the sainted Bishop Rosati of St. Louis. Archbishop Kenrick wished to spend this memorial day in quiet contemplation without any public manifestations as are usual on such occasions. But the German Catholics of the city expressed their loyalty by a grand torchlight procession; and the Archbishop accepted the ovation with meek submission and gentle patience.

Twenty-five years of constant labor and self-sacrifice had merited for him a vacation. The Eternal City was his goal. The occasion was the Eighteen Hundredth Anniversary of the Martyrdom of St. Peter, which was to be celebrated in Rome in 1867. A large part of the Catholic episcopacy of the world was expected to attend the festivities.

On May 27, 1867, Archbishop Kenrick, accompanied by Father Patrick J. Ryan, then pastor of the Annunciation Church, left St. Louis for Cape Girardeau whence after the ordination of nine priests, they proceeded to Boston, and there took the Steamer *Asia* on June 5, en route for Rome. They landed in Ireland, and, after a brief stay, journeyed to Rome, where they were received with high honors. There they attended the celebration that had called them to Rome. In union with the assembled prelates, the Archbishop signed the solemn protest against the spoliation of the Holy See by the Italian revolutionists, and a declaration that the temporal power of the Pope was necessary for the freedom of the Church. Passing through Italy, Germany and France, the Archbishop returned to Dublin, where he spent delightful days of rest amid the familiar scenes of his early life. It was in his native Dublin that he uttered from the pulpit the touching testimonial of his love for his native land: "Ireland differs from other nations in this, that whilst these have given martyrs to the Church, she is the martyr-nation of the world."

---

<sup>1</sup> Father Patrick J. Ryan in the course of time became Coadjutor to the Archbishop of St. Louis and Archbishop of Philadelphia.



On June 16, 1868, the Archbishop and his companion landed in New York and on June 23 arrived in St. Louis. He was met by a delegation of priests and laymen, who escorted him to his residence near St. John's Church. On the following Sunday a public reception was held in honor of the Archbishop's return. The procession was nearly three miles long. His Grace received the greetings of his episcopal city standing on the doorstep of his house. Mr. R. A. Bakewell delivered the address of welcome; and the Archbishop responded briefly.

During the Archbishop's absence the Vicar General of the Archdiocese, Father Melcher, had exercised the functions of government, and the Bishop of Alton, Damien Henry Juncker, had administered the sacrament of Holy Orders to four candidates for the ministry, among them the future Vicar General of the Archdiocese Father Hoog. On July 12 the Archbishop consecrated Joseph Melcher Bishop of Green Bay, Wisconsin. This solemn function took place at St. Mary's Church.

Fathers Patrick J. Ryan and Henry Muehlsiepen were now appointed Vicars General, and Father Charles Ziegler succeeded to the office of Secretary. Vicar General Ryan became pastor of St. John's Church in place of Father Ring.

On September 12 the Archbishop consecrated his old friend John Joseph Hogan Bishop of St. Joseph, Missouri.

The year 1869 brought to the Archbishop the old round of duties; cornerstone-layings, church dedications, ordinations, services and sermons in his pro-cathedral of St. John. In the meantime events of great moment were unfolding themselves in the Church Universal. On July 3, 1868, His Holiness Pope Pius IX had issued the call to the Bishops of the Catholic World for an ecumenical Council, to assemble at the Vatican Basilica on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, December 8, 1869. A little later a very fatherly invitation went out from the Pope to the separated brethren of the Eastern schismatic churches and to the Protestant Christians throughout the world. It was the first ecumenical Council within four hundred years since the great Council of Trent. Since those early days of protestant storm and stress, a saddening change had come over Christendom. The spirit of protest against some of the tenets of the Church had at last resulted in the spirit of absolute negation of all revealed truth. Indeed, the Catholic Church, and she alone, had remained firm in the joyful profession of all the sacred truths once delivered to the saints. And now the church was girding herself to take up the gage of spir-

itual warfare, and to strike the blow that should lay low the triple head of the dragon, infidelity, heresy and schism.

Archbishop Kenrick was deeply interested in these preparations for the inevitable conflict. In his Pastoral Letter of 1865 he had taken occasion to publish the much maligned "Syllabus of the Principal Errors of our Time," adverting to its importance in the following words:

"The Holy Father has availed Himself of the publication of the Jubilee-Indulgence to condemn certain prevalent errors of our times, as also to promulgate in a collected form, condemnations of the same or similar errors, made by him since he ascended the Pontifical chair. These authoritative declarations we receive with all the reverence and respect which is due to the voice of the Vicar of Christ; recognizing in that voice our only sure and safe guidance amidst the labyrinth of human errors; as also obeying the authority of Him who speaks to us, on this occasion, through the successor of Peter, placed as was Peter to confirm his brethren."<sup>2</sup>

Whilst, however, accepting the guidance of the Pope without reserve and without fear of consequences, Archbishop Kenrick had some misgivings in regard to the question of Papal infallibility which he felt sure, would be proposed to the deliberation of the Council. Of course, he never for a moment, doubted the infallibility of the Church in all matters of Faith and Morals. Nor did he doubt the infallibility of the Pope, when speaking as the Head of the Church in union with her members. It was this very faith that made him extol, even beyond the bounds of truth, that famous saying of St. Vincent of Lerins: "Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est, id est Catholica veritas," as if these words could also be applied in a negative way: quod non semper, quod non ubique, quod non ab omnibus creditum est, id non est Catholica veritas."<sup>3</sup> The fact is: there

<sup>2</sup> The Syllabus, sent to the Bishops of the Catholic Church by Pope Pius IX on December 8, 1864, together with the Encyclical letter, "Quanta Cura," is an authoritative condemnation in eighty propositions, of an equal number of errors of this time, ranging from pantheism to liberalism. The sixteen propositions condemned by the Encyclical *Quanta Cura* certainly fall under the judgment of Papal infallibility. As to the rest theologians are not agreed, some holding that all those condemnations are made by infallible authority; others maintaining that the negative character of the propositions leave a certain liberty of interpretation as to the dogmatic sense of each. All Catholics must hold, however, that the entire Syllabus, being an emanation from the Supreme pastoral and teaching office of the church, must be accepted by all with the submission of mind and will.

<sup>3</sup> "What was believed always, and everywhere, and by all, that is Catholic truth," St. Vincent. "What was not always believed, nor everywhere, nor by all, that is not Catholic truth."

were before the Vatican Council, two schools of Catholic thought, one commonly designated as ultramontane, the other roughly comprised under the title of Gallican. Like the schismatic Orient, the Gallican believed in synthetic organization. The single churches being grouped together in a larger unit; the ultramontane builded constructively from the center of Unity—from Rome. "Among the native Catholics of England," wrote a keen observer of the times, "and more with the clergy probably than with the laity, there was a considerable survival of what is called Gallicanism, a sort of national pride and tendency in religion, as opposed to the other extreme known as Ultramontanism. Manning described himself as an Ultramontane, and Newman as a Gallican. Of course, there is between these two views no disagreement in faith, though one would sometimes suppose differently from the heated language occasionally indulged in by one or the other towards the opposite party."<sup>4</sup>

Archbishop Kenrick's view of the Church and its Head inclined to that of the Gallicans. He, as so many another leader of thought and spokesman of the faith of his day, believed, that it was the office of the Bishop of Rome, as Supreme Pontiff, to decide controversies and condemn errors, and that such decisions and condemnations must be regarded as final and infallible, *if accepted by the Universal Church*. According to this view, the College of the Bishops, whether assembled in Council or dispersed in their sees, in union however with the Roman Pontiff, were the true seat of infallibility, but the Pope, separated from the body of the Bishops, if that were possible, did not enjoy the gift. Practically, there was no difficulty, as the Pope's decrees and decisions in matters of Faith and Morals, had always been accepted by the Church as infallible utterances. For this very reason many considered a formal decision on the matter altogether unnecessary, and in a way hurtful to the Church.

Among the Catholics of England the two great leaders of thought, Manning and Newman, both converts to the Faith, held opposite views, not on Papal infallibility itself, but on the opportuneness of its definition. "The great Archbishop of Westminster," says a contemporary writer, "was, before and during the Vatican Council, the strongest of the many strong promoters of the definition: whilst the humble son of St. Philip Neri, though ready to receive a clear definition of that doctrine, did not think it opportune at that time. His own treatise on development showed that the entire scroll of the truth had been held by the church free from injury from the very beginning,

---

<sup>4</sup> Thomas F. Galway, *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, vol. 31-25.

but that it was unfolded by the Church during the ages only just as fast as intellectual progress, and denials or discussions brought each several phase of the truth more and more into intimate relation with the thought or the needs of the time. Like many other Catholics whose faith was absolutely unimpeachable, he dreaded the effects that would follow, as he believed, on the definition of infallibility among the great masses of non-Catholics who did not understand the meaning of papal infallibility as held by Catholics, and would perversely persist in misunderstanding it." In 1866 he wrote that he thought "its definition inexpedient and unlikely. Manning, at this time, was quite sure of the contrary, and was fretted by the attitude of Newman and those in England who thought with Newman. Both were Catholics of sound Faith, but each placed a particular emphasis on that by which he had been drawn to the Church."<sup>5</sup>

Archbishop Kenrick entertained a very high regard for both Manning and Newman, but his preference between the two was Newman. Not that the influence of Newman, in any way, warped his judgment on this or any other matter. Archbishop Kenrick was an independent thinker, and simply held the opinion he had always held since he came to man's estate, as he tells us in his "Concio Habenda sed non Habita": "Almost forty years have passed since I there (in Maynooth College) pursued the study of Theology under the learned John O'Hanlon, then lecturer in Theology, now professor of higher theological science in the same college. The treatise *De Ecclesia* by that man of venerated memory, Delahogue, one of the French emigres in the time of the great French Revolution, contained nothing on the infallibility of the Pope, except a thesis conceived in these words: "Infallibilitas Summi Pontificis non est de Fide."

"In 1831, the aforesaid lecturer on Theology, O'Hanlon, of his own accord, gave us the thesis—'The Pope, speaking *ex cathedra* is infallible,' not to convince us of it, but to give us the opportunity of becoming acquainted with this weighty opinion, by the reasons in favor of it, adduced from various quarters. I confess that I was one of those who took the affirmative. But the new and hitherto unheard of procedure did not meet the approval of all the professors, one of whom, the lecturer on Holy Scripture, who afterwards became President of the College, expressed his displeasure in pretty plain terms, to my classmate, now Bishop of Clonfert, from whom I learned the fact."<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Idem, *ibidem*.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Peter Richard Kenrick, *Concio Habenda at non Habita in Tuside View of the Vatican Council*, p. 149.

Such reminiscences served the Archbishop as premonitions of the great struggle in which he was to figure far more prominently than he expected or desired. Yet he felt assured that all would be well with the Church. As to himself personally he had but little concern. *Securus judicat orbis terrarum*,<sup>7</sup> was his watchword as it had been that of Newman.

But the time had now arrived when he must start for the Eternal City. In view of his protracted attendance at the Council he appointed Vicar General Ryan as administrator of the Archdiocese with Vicar General Muehlsiepen in charge of the German and Bohemian parishes. The date of this double appointment was October 8, 1869. The Archbishop landed in Ireland. In Dublin in November he was joined by Father Constantine Smith, whom he had chosen as his secretary and theologian. Journeying to Paris, he spent three weeks, visiting the various places of interest in that renowned capital. "One day," writes Father Smith, "the Archbishop had just recounted to me the history of the various treasures of the sacristy of Notre Dame, and as we re-entered the Cathedral, I saw standing looking towards its pulpit an ecclesiastic of imposing figure and striking countenance. Archbishop Manning stood before us. The two prelates saluted and spoke to each other for a few moments. They dined a few evenings after together. Thus chance brought about the meeting of the two prelates who were destined to exercise, each in his way, a most decided influence on the deliberations of the Vatican Council."<sup>8</sup>

Archbishop Connolly of Halifax, and Father Hecker, the founder of the Paulists, joined Archbishop Kenrick on the journey from Paris to the Holy City. On their way they visited the Cathedral of Strassburg and spent a few days in Munich. They then entered Tyrol, crossed the Brenner Pass, and followed the Eisack and the Adige rivers into the Trentino. As they passed the historic town of Trent, they gazed upon the church in which the most renowned Council of the Church's history had been held four hundred years previous. Shortly afterwards, the travelers emerged from the narrow defiles of the valley and entered the plains of Lombardy. They passed through Florence and in the morning of December 1, arrived in Rome. Apartments in one of the ancient palaces were assigned to the Archbishop and his Secretary.

"One week after our arrival," wrote Father Smith, "on the

<sup>7</sup> It was Wiseman's quotation of St. Augustine's word, "*Securus judicat orbis terrarum*," which has been interpreted to mean "Catholic consent is the safe judge of controversy," that finally decided Newman's conversion.

<sup>8</sup> The Catholic Standard and Times, Philadelphia, March 21, 1896.



morning of the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, December 8, 1869, amid salvos of artillery from the castle of St. Angelo and the pealing of bells and the play of fountains in the great square of St. Peter's, descended the *scala regia* in rich pontificals, the Bishops of the Catholic world, called to take part in the deliberations of the Vatican Council. Along the Grand Vestibule, at either end of which is an equestrian statue of Constantine and Charlemagne, and on through the great doors of St. Peter's the procession moved. Up an Avenue through St. Peter's, formed by two lines of soldiers of the Antibe Legion, it proceeded till it reached the confessional, or high altar, where it turned to the right and entered the council chamber. At this door I left the side of the Archbishop and was conducted to a seat in one of the loggias. Solemn Pontifical Mass commenced. At the farther end of the chamber sat Pío Nono upon his throne, having his Cardinals seated on each side of him in the form of wings. Immediately before and facing him sat the Patriarchs. Further on to his right, on ascending tiers the archbishops and bishops were arranged according to seniority. I noticed that my Archbishop ranked that day the seventh oldest in the world. When the ceremonies of the Mass were completed, the Pope rose and in a tone of voice of marvelous clearness and almost preternatural power intoned the "Te Deum." The thousand assembled prelates took it up, the joyous wave of sound swelled beyond the enclosure of the Aula and re-echoed back from more than 100,000 human voices, and reverberating through the vast edifice died away in the great dome. The Vatican Council was opened."<sup>9</sup>

## II. ARCHBISHOP KENRICK'S PART IN THE COUNCIL

The Vatican Council was, even from the historical point of view, one of the greatest events of the Ninetenth Century. The number of prelates from all parts of the globe assembled in Rome, about nine hundred, was far greater than that of any previous Council of the Church. The Pope, as spiritual ruler of the Church Universal, was still the temporal Sovereign of Rome and the surrounding territory called the Patrimony of St. Peter. All the magnificence of pomp and ceremony with which the greatest artistic force of the world was able to produce was thrown around the wonderful gathering. The mystical Orient and the rationalistic Occident were looking on with rapt interest and expectation. The statesmen of Europe, Bismarck, Gladstone, Napoleon III, Prince Hohenlohe, the leaders in historical science, Doellinger, Lord Acton, Maret, Dupanloup and a host of oth-

<sup>9</sup> *Idem*, *ibidem*.



ers were calling the world's attention to the prospects of the historic assembly, for good or for evil, according to the position of the observers. The meeting place was the right transept of the mightiest Cathedral of Christendom, specially fitted up for the occasion. The Pope himself presided at the public sessions, whilst the General Congregations were conducted by one of the five Cardinals appointed for the purpose by the Holy Father. The subject matter to be submitted to the Fathers of the Council had been previously prepared by a special commission of learned theologians and canonists from various nations. It was arranged under four heads:

- I. Concerning Faith.
- II. Concerning Discipline.
- III. Concerning Regular Orders.
- IV. Concerning Oriental Rites.

The first section, concerning Faith, was subdivided into three schemata:

- I. On Catholic Doctrine.
- II. On the Church, and its Head, and its Relation to Civil Society.
- III. On Matrimony.

By order of the Pope four standing committees or deputations of twenty-four members each, were formed, all except the presiding Cardinal, elected by the Council. These deputations were to receive all the objections and emendations the Fathers thought proper to make in regard to the various schemata submitted to them in printed form, with the Pope's declaration that they were "*nulla nostra approbatione munita*," that they were, therefore, subject to discussion. The Holy Father stated at the same time, that the Fathers of the Council were at liberty to propose any new matter that was of real benefit to the Church.

The order of proceeding as defined by His Holiness was as follows: The Fathers of the Council were to examine each schema, and then submit their criticisms and emendations, to the deputation that had charge of the particular matter. The deputation was then to examine the remarks of the Bishops and decide whether they were pertinent and acceptable or not. One of the delegation then was to refer the matter to the General Congregation, which was almost daily in session; and it was the privilege of each member of the Council to express his opinion on the matter or form of the proposed schema. When completed the Constitution, as it was then called, was to be sub-

mitted to the vote of the assembled Fathers and then announced to the world by the Holy Father himself.<sup>10</sup>

The first public session of the Council was held on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, December 8, 1869, for the purpose of organization. In the second public session, which was held on the Feast of the Epiphany, January 6, 1870, the Holy Father first made the solemn Profession of Faith, and then the Fathers of the Council, after hearing the profession of Faith read to them, approached the papal throne, and each took the oath on the Gospels; "*Ego, N. N. Episcopus N. N. spondeo, voveo et iuro iuxta formulam praelectam. Sic me Deus adjuvet et haec Sancta Dei Evangelia.*"

The real work of the Council was done in the General Congregations, the first one of which was held on December 10, 1869, under the presidency of Cardinal de Luca. There were present six hundred and seventy-nine Fathers. Of English speaking Bishops Manning, Spaulding, Leahy and Alemany, of Germans and Austrians Simor, Ledochowski, Senestrey, Gasser and Bishop Martin of Paderborn were members of the standing Committee or Congregation that had charge of Matters on Catholic Faith.

The Schema on Catholic Doctrine was up for discussion. Cardinal Rauscher of Vienna made the first address and was followed by Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis. The archbishop spoke briefly and to the point, saying that the schema did not meet his approval, as it was too lengthy, and as its form deviated from that of counciliar decrees. He would advise that a selection of these chapters be made for discussion which seemed most necessary, and that the deputation on matters of Faith then elaborate an exposition of the Faith and submit it to the Council for approval.<sup>11</sup>

The discussions on the Schema concerning Catholic Doctrine as opposed to the principal errors of the times, being finished in the Forty-Sixth Congregation, the Third Public Session of the Council was called for April 24, 1870. About four and one-half months had been consumed in accomplishing such a small part of the matter proposed to the Council. Immediately after the solemn promulgation of the *Constitutio Dogmatica De Fide Catholica*, a large number of the Fathers were permitted to leave for home. Some had been excused from further attendance on the sessions of the Council two months previous, among them the American Bishops Melcher, Hogan,

<sup>10</sup> The Acts and Decrees of the Vatican Council fill volume VII of the great *Collectio Lacensis*.

<sup>11</sup> Archbishop Kenrick had taken the same stand on a similar occasion at the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore.

Lamy, Feehan and O'Gorman. These prelates received leave to return to their dioceses on account of the urgent wants of their new ecclesiastical districts.

On March 6, 1870, Archbishop Kenrick directed a letter from Rome to his faithful friend, Vicar General Muehlsiepen, in which he gave expression to his feeling of weariness and dissatisfaction:

"Most of us are very tired of Rome, and would willingly leave it. The Council has been now three months in session, and nothing has been done. The body is too big for work, unless divided into sections; and those who had the management of matters were, and are, unwilling to attend to the suggestions made to them by those who had experience in similar assemblies. Should you ever come across an article which appeared in the *Moniteur* of Paris, about three weeks ago, you will find a detailed and realistic account of what has been the character of our proceedings and the cause of their insuccess.

"The regulations first made have been found insufficient, new ones have been promulgated; with what results remains to be seen. They appear to many, among whom I count myself, to be highly objectionable, and scarcely reconcilable with the liberty a Council should have. Their immediate effect is to suspend our ordinary general congregations, of which we have had three or four every week. In the last twelve days we have had none; and it is said that two or three weeks more may elapse before we be again summoned to meet.

The Council appears to have been convoked for the special purpose of defining the Papal Infallibility and enacting the propositions of the Syllabus as general laws of the Church. Both objects are deemed by a minority, of which I am one, inexpedient and dangerous, and are sure to meet with serious resistance. The minds of both parties are considerably excited; and there is every reason to fear, that the Council, instead of uniting with the Church those already separated from it, will cause divisions among ourselves most detrimental to Catholic interests. Let us pray that the Providence of God may overrule the passions of men."<sup>12</sup>

The next subject to be treated by the Council was the Schema De Ecclesia. This Schema, in its original form, treated (1) of the Church as the Living Body of Christ, (2) of the Pope as the Head of the Church, (3) of the relations existing between the Church and Civil Society. But in accordance with Archbishop Kenrick's suggestion, though not in consequence of it, the Presiding Cardinals substituted that part of the matter which seemed most important to

<sup>12</sup> Original in Archdiocesan Chancery of St. Louis.

them, and to many Fathers of the Council as early as Christmas day, 1869, the Archbishop of Malines had made use of his privilege to call for the immediate treatment of the Supreme Power in the Church.

The doctrine of Papal Infallibility is clearly announced in the Archbishop's proposal, though the word itself is not used. In the meantime Archbishop Manning was busy getting the signatures of some four hundred Fathers of the Council to a petition for the dogmatic decision on the Infallibility of the Pope. This petition was sent to the Presiding Cardinal on January 28, 1870, to be submitted to His Holiness. The petition had its intended effect. Instead of the original Schema De Ecclesia Christi, the *Constitutio Prima De Ecclesia Christi*, containing a brief introduction and three chapters on the Primacy of the Supreme Pontiff and a fourth chapter on His Infallibility was introduced.<sup>13</sup>

It seems now that the storm which had been raging around the Council Chamber raised a serious disturbance among the Fathers in Council assembled. There was a comparatively small, but very able and tireless minority, whose members opposed the definition of the Infallibility of the Pope, who, however, were held together, not on a fixed principle of accord, but by an agreement to defeat, if possible, the majority of the so-called infallibilists.

To analyze the constituent parts of this body we shall, with Cardinal Gibbons, class them according to ideas.

"The first class comprised those, who, believing the doctrine themselves, or at least, favoring it speculatively, did not think it capable of definition, not deeming the tradition of the Church clear enough on this point.

"A second class, the most numerous, regarded the definition as possible, but practically fraught with peril to the Church, as impeding conversions, as exasperating to governments. For the sake of peace, and for the good of souls, they would not see it proclaimed as of faith.

<sup>13</sup> Before the opening of the Vatican Council Archbishop Kenrick's stand on Papal Infallibility was substantially that of his brother, the Archbishop of Baltimore: "That way of speaking is not approved, according to which the Pope is declared to be infallible of himself alone; for scarcely any Catholic theologian is known to have claimed for him as a private teacher the privilege of inerrancy. Neither as Pope is he alone, since to him teaching, the college of bishops gives its adhesion, which, it is plain, has always happened. But no orthodox writer would deny that pontifical definitions accepted by the college of bishops, whether in council or in their sees, either by subscribing decrees, or by offering no objection to them, have full force and infallible authority." *Theologia Dogmatica, quam concinnavit Franciscus Patricius Kenrick*, Vol. I, p. 241, 242.

"All of these dissident prelates," adds the gentle Cardinal, the last survivor of the Council, "acted with conscientious conviction of the justice of the cause they defended. They were bound in conscience to declare their opinions, and to make them prevail by all lawful influence. If on one side or the other of this most important and vital question, they went beyond the limits of moderation, or used means not dictated by prudence or charity, it is nothing more than might have been expected in so large a number of persons, of such varied character and education."<sup>14</sup>

Our own Archbishop Kenrick was a member of this party, and in particular, one of the first class, as described by the Cardinal, favoring Papal Infallibility speculatively, as a theological opinion, but one not capable of definition."

We, the Church's children of a later day, for whom the clear, concise and comprehensive definition of the Vatican Council has removed all doubt, and most difficulties, may wonder, how a churchman of Archbishop Kenrick's undoubted loyalty, genuine piety and strict orthodoxy could stand up before the assembled Bishops of the world, to oppose the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility; for oppose it he did, though not to the point of absolute denial. Archbishop Kenrick was too strong and outspoken a character to fear the possible effects of a truth, when he was convinced that it was a truth. He cannot, therefore, be called a mere opportunist, as some would have him considered. He held that the doctrine was not as yet sufficiently clear, nor firmly established in the consciousness of the Church to merit a dogmatic definition. In this sense he might have been called an inopportunist. On listening, however, to the arguments of the opposition leaders, a number of whom were really great and good men, and himself revolving in his mind the numerous historical facts that seemed to contradict the opinion of the doctrine's defenders, an honest doubt arose in his mind, whether the Pope could judge securely and infallibly, unless he acted in union with the Universal Church, of which the Bishops were divinely appointed spokesmen.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Life of Cardinal Gibbons, by Allen Sinclair Will, Vol. I, p. 126.

<sup>15</sup> On the title page of his *Concio* Archbishop Kenrick quoted the words of Sacred Scripture, "O Timothee, depositum custodi, devitans profanas vocum novitates et oppositiones falsi nominis scientiae, quam quidam promittentes circa fidem exciderunt. I Tim., 6-20, 21, intimating thus that the doctrine of Papal Infallibility did not belong to the depositum fidei. By adding the dictum of Paschasius Radbertus, "Not upon Peter alone, but upon all the apostles and successors of the apostles was the Church of God founded," Lib. VIII, in Matt. 16, he intimated that the entire college of Bishops, with the Pope as the head, was the true seat of infallibility.



Of course there never was the least doubt in the Archbishop's mind, that infallibility was present in an ecumenical Council, where the Head and the Members, the Pope and the Bishops, concurred in rendering a decision on Faith or Morals. Nor did he ever doubt, that, if the Pope spoke as Head of the Church, even without the Concurrence of the Bishops, his decision was infallible, if the Bishops of the world accepted it within reasonable time. "*Roma locuta, causa finita.*" All this the great Archbishop saw as plainly as any one. But what he does not seem to have seen for a time was that the Pope's decisions must be infallible in themselves or, as the Council expressed it, "*ex sese, non ex consensu Ecclesiae irreformabiles.*" Yet such is the fact. For if the Pope could err in official decisions on Faith or Morals, whilst the Bishops of the Church, either in Council assembled, or dispersed throughout the world, faithfully held to the truth, the seamless garment of the Church would be rent asunder, the unity of faith would be lost.

The debate on the Fourth Chapter of the First Constitution on the Church, which treats of the Pope's Infallibility was begun immediately after the third public session. A very large number of the Fathers announced their intention to address the Council on the question. Archbishop Kenrick at first intended to maintain silence, as he took for granted anything pertinent to the subject would be more fully and forcibly said by others." But as Archbishop Cullen of Dublin, a member of the deputation on matters of Faith, had from the pulpit said some things in which the American Prelate's honor was sorely wounded, he felt obliged to answer his charges, and, as he was not permitted to reply at once, he joined the long series of the Fathers who had asked and received permission to make an address at the proper time. This happened in the Fifty-fifth General Conference, May 20.

Archbishop Kenrick attended the long succession of the Congregations or meetings of the Council and listened attentively to the exhaustive and often exhausting streams of eloquence for and against the matter proposed. Cardinal Gibbons, then only Bishop Gibbons, describes him in a few choice words in his "*Retrospect of Fifty Years.*" "Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis was among the most noteworthy prelates from the United States. Archbishop Kenrick spoke Latin with most admirable ease and elegance. I observed him, day after day, reclining in his seat with half-closed eyes, listening attentively to the debates, without taking any notes. And yet so tenacious was his memory that, when his turn came to ascend the rostrum, he



reviewed the speeches of his colleagues with remarkable fidelity and precision without the aid of manuscript or memoranda." <sup>16</sup>

The meetings were held during the hours between 9 and 12 in the morning. The afternoons and evenings were free, for rest, study and social calls. Archbishop Kenrick's secretary, Father Constantine Smith, has left us a fine description of what occupied the minds of the opposition members of the Council.

"Frequent meetings of various shades of opinion as to the opportuneness or the inopportuneness of the definition of the Papal Infallibility were now held outside the Council chamber. Effectually, Rome was divided into two camps. For three months, the greatest intellectual men of the Church were almost equally divided against each other.

Manning, the consummate ecclesiastical statesman, rather than the profound theologian, in virtue of his great eloquence, controlled in a masterful way the forces of the infallibilists. With him were the Bishops of Malines, Ratisbonne and Paderborn. The chief among the French opponents were Dupanloup and Darboy; also Cardinal Mathieu and Bonnechose. The chief Austrian opponents were Cardinals Schwarzenberg and Rauscher and Bishop Strossmayer. Bishop Hefele headed the German opposition. Archbishop Kenrick stood at the head of the opponents belonging to the American episcopate. But there was one man, not attending the Council, not a Cardinal, not a Bishop, who wielded among English-speaking peoples an influence more potent, though silent, against the definition of the dogma of the infallibility than any other, viz., John Henry Newman, afterwards created a Cardinal.

After three months of debate, during which period, the intellectual forces were equally divided, after the intellectual opponents had exhausted every lawful method of debate, every resource that could be devised; after every argument, philosophical, scriptural, social, moral, civil, had been exhausted in trying to defeat or even postpone the definition, on this 13th of July the contest ended, the most memorable that had ever taken place in the annals of ecclesiastical history. It was well. Both sides acknowledged that no more could be done; God alone could decide it. Up to this for His own wise ends, God permitted the full play of human reason, often swayed by deepest feeling. But now the Divine illumination came." <sup>17</sup>

But before this final act, Archbishop Kenrick took a step that was to bring upon him the harsh judgment of many Catholics and the

<sup>16</sup> Cardinal Gibbons, *Retrospect of Fifty Years*, vol. I, p. 32.

<sup>17</sup> *The Catholic Standard and Times*, Philadelphia, March 21, 1896.

still more disagreeable plaudits of the sectaries and so-called liberals, without accomplishing the least practical result. One hundred and eleven Fathers had announced their intention to address the Council: Forty-six had spoken by the beginning of July. Sixty-five names were still on the list. Dark war-clouds had arisen on the horizon; if the question of Papal Infallibility were not acted upon within a short time, the whole matter would have to rest in abeyance. The honor of the Church required that the center of unity, the Divine institution of the Papacy, should not receive such a terrible setback. The vast majority of Fathers was in favor of the definition of the infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff. The members of the opposition were using dilatory tactics. In the Eighty-second Congregation held July 4, the Presiding Cardinal suggested that the Fathers who were still booked to speak, should renounce their right. All the orators, excepting two, acquiesced. There were four hundred and sixty-nine Fathers present at this Congregation. Archbishop Kenrick was not present and thereby lost his right to speak. But he was determined to bring his views to the knowledge of the Fathers of the Council. He sent his Secretary, Father Smith, to Naples to supervise the publication of his pamphlet entitled, "*Concio Petri Ricardi Kenrick, Archiepiscopi S. Ludovici in Statibus Foederatis Americae Septentrionalis in Concilio Vaticano Habenda at non Habita, Naples, 1870.*"<sup>18</sup> This publication was intended for the Fathers only, but to be circulated outside the Council chamber. It was in substance a belated attempt to refute the strictures, Archbishop Cullen of Dublin and Archbishop Manning of Westminster had made on his objections to the Schema on the Church of Christ.

In his *Concio* Archbishop Kenrick speaks in the highest terms of admiration of these two great churchmen: "It was with great delight that I listened to the recent speech of the Archbishop of Westminster in this assembly. I was at a loss which most to admire, the eloquence of the man, or his fiery zeal in moving or rather commanding us to enact the new definition. The lucid arrangement of topics, the absolute felicity of diction, the singular grace of elocution and the supreme authority and candor of mind which was resplendent in his speech almost extorted from me the exclamation: '*Talis cum sis, utinam noster esses.*'"

Archbishop Kenrick's *Concio* is not so much an attack upon the Pope's Infallibility, as rather a defense of the infallibility of the Bishop's united with the Pope. It has become one of the rarest of

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Granderath, S. J., *Geschichte des Vatikanische Konzils*, vol. III, ch. 10, pp. 288-292.

books: however, it is reprinted in Professor Friederich's *Documenta and Illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum*. The American Tract Society published an English translation, edited by Leonard Woolsey Bacon.

The decisive moment came on July 13. The Eighty-fifth general Congregation, which was attended by six hundred and one Conciliar Fathers, four hundred and fifty-one voted, *Placet*; eighty-three, *Non placet*, and sixty-two: *Placet Juxta modum*. The question had been decided by an overwhelming majority; the minority realized that their cause, so bravely and skillfully defended, was lost: but not convinced of the opposite view, they decided to absent themselves from the final public session on July 18. By order of the Pope, the Secretary read the *Constitutio Dogmatica Prima De Ecclesia Christi*, and then invited the Fathers to give their vote, either *Placet* or *Non-Placet*. All but two voted, *Placet*; and these two immediately after the definition gave in their adhesion.<sup>19</sup>

The Holy Father then rose and confirmed the Constitution with his supreme authority, and addressed a few touching words to the assembled Fathers: "The highest authority of the Roman Pontiff does not oppress but erect, does not destroy but builds up, and frequently confirms in dignity, unites in charity and strengthens and supports the rights of the Bishops. Therefore, those who now judge in a state of commotion, should know that a few years hence, they who once held the contrary judgment will abound in our judgment, and then they will judge "in spiritu aurae lenis."<sup>20</sup> How beautifully these prophetic words of Pio Nono were fulfilled in the case of Archbishop Kenrick, we shall see in the following chapter.

### III. ARCHBISHOP KENRICK'S SUBMISSION TO THE VATICAN DECREES

After the promulgation of the infallible teaching authority of the Roman Pontiff in the Fourth open session of the Council the participants received permission to absent themselves until November 11, on which day the discussion of the remaining schemata should be taken up. The work of the deputations, however, was to continue throughout the summer months. But it appeared before long that this plan could not be carried out. On July 19 the war between Germany and France broke out, and at the withdrawal of the French garrison

<sup>19</sup>Only two Bishops voted *Non Placet*, one of them was Bishop Fitzgerald of Little Rock. But both Bishops immediately accepted the dogma, Bishop Fitzgerald saying to the Pope: "Now I believe, Most Holy Father."

<sup>20</sup>Granderath, vol. III, p. 500.

from Rome, the troops of Victor Emmanuel took possession of the Eternal City. Under these circumstances the Pope, on October 20, suspended the sessions of the Council.

Archbishop Kenrick had left Rome with the other members of the minority, sad at heart and undecided as to what his future course should be. There were some men of honored name who tried to draw him into open rebellion against what had now been declared a dogma of Faith. But those who knew that Archbishop Kenrick never failed to make his daily meditation, had no fear for him in this regard. Such a man of prayer would not follow in the footsteps of a Doellinger or a Reinkens. Yet the future looked black and perplexing.

On his homeward journey this spiritual conflict was carried to the proper conclusion. The cause for which he had fought during the Council was, after all, only a part of the truth: the infallibility of the Bishops in union with the Pope. According to the decision of the Council where Pope and Bishops had acted in unison, the full truth was the infallibility of the Pope, not only when speaking by advice or consent of the episcopate, but always when speaking *ex cathedra*, and defining a doctrine of Faith or Morals for the universal church. Practically the Archbishop had always held this to be true, though not satisfied with the reasons put forward to prove it. But the Council had spoken; and the Catholic world had, to all appearances, accepted the decision as final. Most of the opponents had submitted to the decision. As for the objections he had urged against the doctrine, and which he still considered true, he had to admit they were not conclusive, and hence, as mere difficulties, he should not allow them to raise a single doubt in his mind, now that the Council had spoken. The dogma, no matter by what means it was brought to a passage, was clearly a truth of Divine revelation.

This course of reasoning is but the interpretation of the Archbishop's own words, addressed to Lord Acton: "Sufficient time seems to have elapsed to allow the Catholic world to decide whether or not the decrees of the Council were to be accepted. The greater number of Bishops in minority had signified their assent to them. Among other names published in one of the Brussels papers, I read with surprise that of Mgr. Maret. Although some still held out, they were so few that hesitating to declare my submission would have had the appearance of rejecting the authority of the Church. **THIS I NEVER INTENDED TO DO.** I could not defend the Council or its action; but I always professed that the acceptance of either by the Church would supply its deficiency. I accordingly made up my mind to sub-

mit to what appeared inevitable, unless I were prepared to separate myself, at least in the judgment of most Catholics, from the Church.'<sup>21</sup>

The Archbishop arrived in St. Louis on December 31, 1870, after an absence of more than fourteen months. His return was quiet and unobtrusive, as he had declined a public reception. Yet an ecclesiastical reception was arranged for the following Sunday. It was held at St. John's Church, and all the bells of the Catholic Churches of the city were rung in honor of the occasion. An address was read by the Vicar General, Very Rev. P. J. Ryan, in St. John's Church, in the presence of many of the secular and regular clergy of the diocese. The Archbishop responded feelingly, saying: "To that portion of the address which refers to my course in the Vatican Council, I have this to say: Up to the very period of that Council I had held as a theological opinion what that Council has decreed to be an article of Christian Faith, and yet I was opposed, most strongly, to the definition. I knew that the misconceptions of its real character would be an obstacle in the way of the diffusion of Catholic truth. At least I thought so. I feared in certain parts of Europe, especially, that such a definition might lead to the danger of schism in the church; and on more closely examining the question itself, in its intrinsic evidence, I was not convinced of the conclusiveness of the arguments by which it was sustained, or of its compatibility with certain well ascertained facts of ecclesiastical history which rose up strongly before my mind. These were the motives of my opposition. The motive of my submission is simply and singly the authority of the Catholic Church. That submission is a most reasonable obedience, because of the necessity of obeying and following an authority established by God; and having the guaranty of our Divine Savior's perpetual assistance is in itself evidence, and cannot be gainsayed by any one who professes to recognize Jesus Christ as his Savior and his God.

Simply and singly on that authority I yield obedience and full and unreserved submission to the definition concerning the character of which there can be no doubt as emanating from the Council and subsequently accepted by the greater part even of those who were in the minority on that occasion. In yielding this submission, I say to the Church in the words of Peter and of Paul, "To whom, O Holy Mother, shall we go, but to thee? Thou hast the words of eternal life;

<sup>21</sup> The letter of Archbishop Kenrick to Lord Acton was first published in Prof. Schulte's *Der Alkatholicismus*, Giessen, 1887. It was republished in the St. Louis daily papers on March 29, 1891.



and we have believed and have known that Thou art the Pillar and the Ground of Truth." <sup>22</sup>

Some theologians found fault with the phrase, "*simply and singly* on the authority of the Church I yield obedience and unreserved submission to the definition," as if the Archbishop meant only an exterior act without an interior conviction. This was a rank injustice, as implying that he, for the sake of being left in place, consented to say what he did not believe. As Archbishop Ryan wrote in his brief Memorial on the death of his friend: "Submission to a doctrine means believing it, and without such faith submission were hypocrisy, of which no man ever dared to accuse the departed prelate." <sup>23</sup> The writer then goes on to prove the Archbishop's absolute sincerity by quoting the introductory words of his address on the occasion of his homecoming: "Up to the very period of the assembling of the Council I had held as a theological opinion what that council had decreed to be an *article of Christian Faith*." <sup>24</sup> But how did the Archbishop surmount the historical difficulties that seemed to stand in the way of his sincerely accepting the truth of the definition. Let us consider his own explanation:

"I reconciled myself intellectually to submission by applying Father Newman's theory of development to the case in point. The pontifical authority, as at present exercised, is so different from what it is supposed to have been in the early Church, that it can only be supposed in substance by allowing a process of doctrinal development. This principle removed Newman's great difficulty, and convinced him that, notwithstanding the difference, he might and should become a Catholic. I thought that it might justify me in remaining one. The positive arguments supplied by tradition for the power as actually exercised are not stronger than those brought forward by the advocates of papal infallibility; nor is it easier to reconcile the Acts of the Fifth Council in reference to Vigilius with the one, than the condemnation of Honorius by the Sixth with the other." <sup>25</sup> And again:

<sup>22</sup> Cf. *The Two Archbishops Kenrick*, by John J. O'Shea, pp. 332 and 333. O'Shea's sketch of Peter Richard Kenrick is a poorly written compilation, but contains a number of important documents.

<sup>23</sup> *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, vol. XXI, p. 427.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 428.

<sup>25</sup> Letter to Lord Acton. Concerning Pope Vigilius, who approved the Acts of the Fifth Council, condemning the teachings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, after he had refused to attend the sessions of the Council. Pope Honorius was condemned by the Sixth Council for a letter he was supposed to have written to Sergius on the two operations in Christ, not defining the question, but counseling silence. In both cases the question of Papal Infallibility was supposed to have been denied. But the case of Vigilius militated against the infallibility of



"I submitted most *unreservedly*, not availing myself of any of the ingenious explications of the dogma, set forth by Mr. Maskell, but taking the words of the decree in their strict and literal significance." <sup>26</sup>

But how shall we reconcile these clearcut statements with the following words from the same letter: "I gave as the motive of my submission "Simply and singly" the authority of the Church by which I was well understood to mean that the act was one of pure obedience, and was not grounded on the removal of my motives of opposition to the decree as referred to in my reply, and set forth in my pamphlets." <sup>27</sup>

In order to understand the full import of this declaration, we must make a distinction. There is a difference between the motives of Catholic Faith, and the motives of credibility of a doctrine. The motive of faith can be but one, the revelation of God made known to us by the infallible authority of the Church. The motives of credibility are many and manifold, some appealing to one, some to another mind; the motive of faith refers to the revealed truths, the motives of credibility to the fact of revelation; the motive of faith produces absolute certitude, the *motiva credibilitatis* only moral certitude. Now, in Archbishop Kenrick's pamphlets published at the time of the Council, the motives of credibility advanced by his opponents in favor of papal infallibility were attacked as either insufficient or utterly worthless. But the promulgation of the infallible teaching authority of the Pope by the Council furnished an all-sufficient motive of credibility as well as the true and only motive of Christian faith: "It is revealed doctrine."

In one particular, and that a very important one, the Archbishop candidly admits having made a mistake in his argument. "My statement, to which your Lordship refers, that Papal Infallibility could not become an article of faith even by the definition of the Council resolves itself into two others; namely that what is not already a doctrine of faith cannot be made so by a conciliar definition, and that papal infallibility, anterior to the definition, was not an article of faith. The first of these propositions is undeniable. The second, it appears, must be given up. My proof of the second was incomplete, as it chiefly referred to countries where the English language is spoken. Even in regard to these countries it does not appear to be

---

the Council as much as the case of Honorius did against the infallibility of the Pope. The fact is that neither case had anything to do with an *ex cathedra* pronouncement.

<sup>26</sup> Letter to Lord Acton.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.

satisfactory, as the principles recognized by the ecclesiastical authorities, in such countries, and generally entertained by the faithful in them, appear to establish the contrary. The power of the Pope in doctrinal matters was universally recognized as a rule of faith; nor was this principle materially affected by the tacit assent of the Church, which even Gallican divines, held to be sufficient to give his decision all the weight of conciliar definitions."<sup>28</sup>

Whether the Archbishop was right in rejecting all and sundry motives of credibility urged by his opponents is not the question here. He may have been mistaken and, in some cases, certainly was mistaken; but the removal of his motive of opposition to the decrees, as set forth in his pamphlets, was not required to enable him to make a sincere and genuine act of faith in the decrees after their approval.

Archbishop Kenrick's letter to Lord Acton does sound one discordant note, in saying: "Notwithstanding my submission, I shall never teach the doctrine of papal infallibility, so as to assure from Scripture or tradition in its support, and shall leave to others to explain its compatibility with the facts of ecclesiastical history, to which I referred in my reply. As long as I may be permitted to remain in my present station, I shall confine myself to administrative functions, which I can do the more easily without attracting observation, as for some years back I have seldom preached."

"I have steadfastly refused to publish a Pastoral Letter on the Council, although urged thereto by one of my suffragans, by the Archbishop of San Francisco and indirectly, through the suffragan bishop referred to, by Cardinal Barnabo. I have also declined to write to the Pope, although the last named (Barnabo), in sending me some marriage dispensations for which I had asked, invited me to do so. I have also refused to take any part in the demonstrations which have been made generally in the United States in favor of the Temporal Power, and my name is not found among those which, in this city, prepared and sent to Rome an address to the Pope on the occasion of the Italian occupation of his territory."<sup>29</sup> I mention these circumstances to show your Lordship that in what I have done I have

<sup>28</sup> Letter to Lord Acton. Strictly speaking not an article of faith, but belonging to the deposit of Faith.

<sup>29</sup> On June 25, 1871, the twenty-fifth anniversary of the elevation of Pope Pius IX to chair of St. Peter was celebrated in the city of St. Louis with imposing ceremonies. There was a parade of Catholic societies four miles in length and a general illumination of the city at night. Bonfires and pyrotechnic displays were also features of the demonstration of loyalty to the Holy Father. The Archbishop was not in the city on that day.

not been actuated by any desire to stand well with the Church authorities in Rome."<sup>30</sup>

These last signs of Archbishop Kenrick's irritation do not refer to the dogma of papal infallibility, but rather to the manner in which it was secured. For he plainly states that he accepted the dogma unreservedly, "simply and singly on the authority of the Church." But how could he preach on the doctrine without touching "on the *motiva credibilitatis*?" And these he did not consider to be convincing. For the same reason, a Pastoral on the Council seemed out of question. As for writing to the Pope or protesting against the spoliation of Rome by the Italians, the Archbishop thought he had no particular reason, especially as his doing so, would have been interpreted by many as a measure inspired by fear. He felt that he had done no more than was his right and duty in the matter, and that he had no apology to offer. We can understand the Archbishop's feelings under such trying circumstances. Yet it would have seemed more consonant with the greatness of his mind if he had, like Fénélon, the Archbishop of Cambrai, under similar circumstances, immediately ascended the pulpit to condemn his pamphlets and throw them into the fire; but the intense and almost unbearable strain of his conciliar activities had seriously reduced his vitality and rendered his nerves all too sensitive. But there was a special occasion for the regrettable outbreak.

Archbishop Kenrick's letter to Lord Acton is dated March 29, 1871. More than two months previous he had written his letter of submission to the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda, Barnabo'. So all requirements seemed fulfilled to place or rather leave Archbishop Kenrick in good standing with the Head of the Church. Only the *Concio* published in Naples in the heat of combat, seemed to threaten a new storm. The pamphlet had been submitted to the Congregation of the Index, and had been condemned as containing grave errors, but through personal consideration had not appeared among the list of prohibited works. Cardinal De Angelis exhorted Kenrick to anticipate its public condemnation by adhering strictly to the decrees of the Council. Pope Pius himself is reported to have said to the Rector of the American College when he announced to him the Archbishop's submission: "Still he must retract those pamphlets published at Naples."<sup>31</sup> If the Pope really said this, he certainly made no great effort to obtain this retraction. But the rumors were irritating. The Pamphlets did not get on the Index of Forbidden Books

<sup>30</sup> Letter to Lord Acton.

<sup>31</sup> Letter to Lord Acton.

and their author was never again reminded of them. Pope Pius was later on reported to have said: "Mgr. Kendrick is a great man, but he is as pious as he is great, and he is as orthodox as he is pious and great."<sup>32</sup> And till later, Pope Leo XIII, according to the account of Cardinal Gibbons, uttered this beautiful and in the main just judgment on Archbishop Kenrick:

"The metropolitan of St. Louis was a noble man and a true Christian Bishop. When he sat in Council as a judge of the Faith, he did according to his conscience, and the moment the decision was taken, although it was against him, submitted with filial piety of a Catholic Christian."<sup>33</sup>

REV. JOHN ROTHENSTEINER.

St. Louis, Missouri.

---

<sup>32</sup> Cardinal Gibbons Retrospect of Fifty Years, vol. I, p. 32.

<sup>33</sup> A. C. Will, Life of Cardinal Gibbons, vol. I, p. 129.

## THE MARTYRS OF THE SOUTHWEST<sup>1</sup>

### I

As we draw back the curtain that conceals the past in the history of the great Southwest, a grand panoramic view presents itself, rivalling in its heroic splendor and chivalry the deeds of the soldiers of the Cross in those cruel and sanguinary scenes in the Christian persecutions by the Roman imperial tyrants.

Hardly had Coronado finished his explorations and discoveries, when human holocausts were offered to sanctify the soil where once the missionaries had labored. Of the five friars who accompanied the expedition, three remained in New Mexico and soon merited their crowns of martyrdom. Padres Juan de Padilla, Luis de Escalona and Juan de la Cruz were these pioneer soldiers of Christ who attempted the conversion of the savage tribes. They were the first priests to preach the Gospel to the natives in the Southwest. Padilla was an Andalusian, who had been guardian at Tulancingo and Zapotlan. His ardent missionary spirit had for its objective the Christianizing of the Quivirans. An escort was furnished the padres as far as Cicuye, where Fray Luis de Escalona remained. Fray Padilla pressed on to Quivira, accompanied by a Portugese named Campo, a negro, a mestizo, and a few Mexican Indians. We learn later that Campo and his companions hurried back to the gulf coast and reported that Padre Padilla had died a martyr at the hands of the Quivirans, who killed him because in his zeal he wished for and attempted the conversions of some hostile tribes.

Juan Jamarillo, one of the captains of the Coronado expedition, states that he had left with Padre Luis de Escalona at Cicuye, a slave boy named Cristobal, and another slave, Melchor Perez, several Indians, one of them a Tarascan named Andres, and two negroes, one named Sebastian, a servant of Jamarillo. Subsequently some sheep were sent to Padre Luis and the messengers on their return reported that he had been well received by the masses of the natives, though

<sup>1</sup> In *Illinois Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. IX, pp. 134-150, there is a contribution by J. J. Ryan entitled "*The Franciscan Missions of California*," in which the author shows the self-sacrifice and zeal of the missionaries in the far west. It is the purpose here to present a similar story, brilliant in events and achievements of the padres in New Mexico and Texas. It is hoped that there will soon appear by the facile pen of some historian an account of the apostolic labors of the Jesuits.



the older men hated him, and would probably bring about his death. It is recorded by the chroniclers that he later merited the grace of martyrdom.

Fray Juan de la Cruz spread the Gospel in the province of the Tiguex and had as his companion, a lay brother Luis de Ubeda. Records show that the priest was shot, but that the life of Ubeda was spared. The latter lived as a hermit in a hut and performed many good deeds. Beaumont in his chronicles represents Fray Marcos de Niza and Fray Daniel as having returned with Coronado's army into Mexico.<sup>2</sup>

Many years elapsed before another *entrada* was attempted. In 1581 Father Augustin Rodriguez was led by his zeal as a missionary, and the desire for martyrdom to undertake an expedition. He applied to the Viceroy Coruña for a license to enter New Mexico. An escort of twenty men was to be provided, but only about one-half of that number could be induced to accompany the friars. The two other Franciscans, who were assigned by the provincial superior to this new field, were the Padres Juan de Santa Maria and Francisco Lopez. On the 6th of June, 1581, the party was ready for its journey north. They left San Bartholome, set out for the Conchos river, and followed it until they reached the Rio Grande. They continued their march to a point along that river and named the place San Felipe, arriving there some time in August. Finally, after much traveling, they reached Puaray in the Tiguas province, and here established their headquarters. The friars remained at this spot, but Chamuscado, the military commander, continued his explorations.

When the soldiers returned, they found the padres already laboring in their new field. The missionaries did not object to the departure of their escort for Mexico. Three southern Indians, whose Christian names were Andres, Francisco and Geronimo, were left behind as interpreters. Francisco later made his appearance at San Bartholome and reported that Padre Lopez, the guardian of the friars, had

<sup>2</sup> Jamarillo, Juan: *Relacion que dio*. In Pacheco, Doc. xiv, pp. 316-317; see also Florida Col. Doc. p. 154; see also Ternaux-Compans, Henri: *Voyages, Relations and Memoires*, 1st series, 364. Torquemada, Juan: *Monarquia Indiana*, III, 610-612; Mendieta, Geronimo: *Historia Ecclesiastica Indiana*, pp. 742-745; Velancurt, Augustin: *Menologia Franciscano*, pp. 121-122; Gomara, Francisco Lopez: *Historia General de las Indias*, p. 274; Beaumont, Pablo: *Cronica de la Provincia de Michoacan*, iv, pp. 378-386; Mota Padilla, Matias: *Historia de la Conquista de N. Galicia*, pp. 167-169; De Courcey, Henry: *The Catholic Church in the United States*, p. 14; Bancroft, Hubert Howe: *Arizona and New Mexico (1530-1888)*, p. 14; Castañeda, Pedro: *Relation du Voyage de Cibola, 1540* (in Ternaux-Compans 1st ser., ix); Engelhardt, Zephyrin: *The Franciscans in Arizona* (see chapter I for defense of Fray Marcos de Niza).



been killed by the natives. In the tumult that followed, the three Indians escaped. Lopez was slain about a league from the pueblo, and his body was brought to the town for burial. His remains were disinterred in 1614 and reburied in the church at Sandia.

Salmeron states that the padres soon discovered that they needed missionary re-enforcement if they wished to carry on successfully the work of the Gospel among these Indian tribes. Santa Maria volunteered to go to Mexico to present the matter before the proper authorities. He had just crossed the Sandia mountains, and stopped to rest under a tree at San Pablo in the Tiguas province. He was discovered by natives, who killed him and burned his remains.

Father Rodriguez was now alone, but even the protection of the Tiguas chief, who removed him to Santiago, a league and a half up the river, did not save his life. Like his confreres he was ruthlessly murdered by the Indians, and his body thrown into the river.

The Franciscans of Nueva Viscaya were very much troubled when they received the reports of the fates of the padres, and Father Bernardino Beltran was eager to verify the accounts about the martyred friars. A new *entrada* was organized with Antonio Espejo as commander. In due time, after many days' traveling, the party arrived at Puaray, where they learned from the natives that both Padres Lopez and Rodriguez met their deaths as already related, and that those who were their attendants were not spared, but were likewise killed in cold blood. Following in the footsteps of Padre Santa Maria, they also ascertained the terrible facts of the cruel and heartless slaughter of that holy man of God, as he rested, tired and footsore, on his lonesome journey south. Padre Beltran, saddened in his soul, began his mournful and weary travel back over the borderland to his convent in San Bartholome.

Espejo, with this lone friar and a few soldiers, had accomplished more than Coronado with his grand army and barbarous oppression of the unoffending natives. By wandering peacefully from province to province, taking notes as he went along, Espejo gathered important details, which he modestly and accurately recorded in his *Relations*, and thereby rekindled the interest and enterprise of the Spaniards in the vast northern wilderness.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Pacheco and Cardenas: *Col. Doc. Ined.*, xv pp. 80-150, 162-189. See Bolton, Herbert Eugene, editor and tr.: *Spanish Exploration in the Southwest*, 1542-1706. Title: *Testimonio dado en Mejico, anos 1582-1583*. Sub-titles: *Declaration of Bustamente*, Pacheco, op. cit. 80-8. *Declaration of Hernando Barrado*, Pacheco, op. cit. 95-7; *Brief and True Account of the Exploration of New Mexico*, op. cit. 146-150; *Report of the Viceroy to the King*, Pacheco, op. cit. 97-100; *Account of Journey to the Provinces and Settlements of New Mexico*—Narrative

Another expedition, after many delays, was arranged by Juan Oñate. The obstacles to the leadership of this new *entrada* were occasioned by the efforts of many other impressarios to obtain licenses for the conquest and government of the new country, which seemed to offer to them great opportunities because of the wealth of its products. Only the persistence, resourcefulness, and patience of Oñate secured for him finally the legal right by contract to start northward with an army of one hundred and thirty soldier-colonists. These were followed soon afterwards by Padre Alonzo Martinez and ten Franciscans. On the 20th of April, 1597, they reached the Rio Grande, and on the last day of the month, a few leagues up the river on the western bank, Oñate with full ecclesiastical solemnity, took formal possession for God, the king, and himself, of New Mexico and the adjoining provinces. This dedication was pronounced in the presence of the friars and all the army. The religious ceremony included Mass offered in a chapel specially built for the occasion. A sermon was preached by Padre Martinez, the *comisario*.<sup>4</sup>

From August 23 to September 7, the time was spent in erecting a church at San Juan de los Caballeros, and on the 8th, the place of worship was opened with great ceremonies. On the 9th, a mass meeting was held, at which many native chiefs and representatives of the pueblos were present. Here all made a formal submission to

---

of Espejo Pacheco, op. cit. 101-126 and 163-189. All of these documents are translated by Bolton. Bancroft, Hubert Howe: *New Mexico and Arizona*, p. 79; Hakluyt's *Voyages*, III, pp. 383, 380-8; Salmeron, Geronimo de Zarate: *Relaciones de New Mexico*—In *Doc. Hist. Mex.*, 3rd Ser. IV, pp. 8-10; Davis, W. W. H.: *Spanish Conquest of New Mexico*, pp. 243-49; Prince L. Bradford: *Historical Sketches of New Mexico*, pp. 149-152; Niel Juan: *Apuntamientos*—In *Doc. Hist. Mex.*, 3rd Ser., IV, pp. 87-88.

<sup>4</sup> Original sources for Oñate expedition are to be found in Pacheco and Cardenas *Documentos Ineditos*, xvi, pp. 38-66, 88-141, 228-322. Titles are as follows: (a) *Translada de la Posesion*, pp. 78-141; See also Villagra, Gaspar: *Historia de Nueva Mexico*, pp. 114-132; (b) *Discurso de las Jornadas*, pp. 228-276; (c) *Copia de Carta Escrita al Virrey*, 1599, pp. 212-22; (d) *Don Alonso de Oñate al Presidente del Consejo de Indias*, pp. 320-322; (f) *Memorial sobre el descubrimiento de Nueva Mexico*, pp. 188-227; (g) *Discurso y Proposicion*, pp. 38-66. The following transcripts of originals in Archivo General de Indias are to be found in the Lowery Collection of the Library of Congress, and in the Ayer Collection of the Newberry Library, Chicago: (a) *Relacion de Como los Padres de San Francisco se encargaron de las Provincias de la Nuevo Mexico* 1598; (b) *Relation que envio Don Juan de Oñate* 1599; (c) *Relacion sacada*; (d) *Relacion Verdadera*; (e) *Paracer de la Audiencia*. See also Salmeron: *Eclaciones* (in *Documentos para la Historia de Mexico*, 3rd Se., see paragraphs 33-57). Translation by Charles F. Lummis: *Land of Sunshine*, vols. xi and xii. See also Torquemada, Juan: *Monarchia Indiana*, Vol. I, book 5, chaps. 36-40. See also Bolton's translations of many of the documents cited in his *Spanish Explorations in the Southwest*. Bancroft: *New Mexico and Arizona*.

Almighty God in things temporal through the king by Oñate, and in matters spiritual through the Pope by the padre *comisario* Martinez. All expressed great joy in receiving the friars as their teachers and masters. Padre Martinez then proceeded to apportion the pueblos among his co-workers. Under the care of Fr. Francisco de San Miguel, the province of Pecos was placed. Fr. Juan Claros received as his obedience, the province of the Tigua; Fr. Juan de Rosas, the province of the Cheres; Fr. Cristobal de Salazar, the province of the Tepúas; Fr. Francisco de Zamora, the province of the Pecuries; Fr. Alonzo de Lugo, the province of the Emmes (Hemes); and Fr. Andres Corchado, the province of the Trias. In all, it is said that about one hundred and seventy pueblos were included, although this number may be somewhat exaggerated, caused by the confusion of the names of the tribes with that of places.

The missionary prospects were so prosperous that early in March Padres Martinez, Salazar and Vergera went south to obtain reinforcements of friars. Salazar died on the way. Martinez was retained in Mexico, but Padre Juan de Escolano was sent in his place as *comisario*. He was accompanied by Vergera and about eight other friars.

The work of evangelization was now fairly under way. By the year 1617 the friars had built eleven chambers, converted fourteen thousand natives and prepared an equal number for conversion. In 1620 Padre Geronimo de Zarate Salmeron, filled with zeal for souls, offered his services in the missionary field. He took up his abode among the Jemes, where for eight years he "sacrificed himself to the Lord among the pagans."

The fruits of his labors were manifold, for he baptized six thousand five hundred and sixty-six natives, mastered their language, and wrote for them a *doctrina*. In 1621 the various missions contained over sixteen thousand converts, and these results necessitated the formation of a *custodia*, known by the name of the Conversion de San Pablo. Padre Alonso Benevides was the first *custos* to occupy this important post. He brought with him from his convent twenty-six friars. Death, sickness and hardship soon thinned these ranks, for in 1626 only sixteen friars and three laymen were left in the field. The labors and sacrifices of the missionaries were bearing abundant fruit in this soil sanctified by the blood of these early martyrs. According to Salmeron and Benevides, over thirty-four thousand had been baptized, and forty-three churches had been built.

The lack of a sufficient number of co-laborers was reported to the viceroy and to the *comisario general* of the order. In the *cedula* of November 15, 1627, the king ordered that thirty more Franciscans be

sent to New Mexico. This reinforcement was supplied with padres from the *Provincia del Santo Evangelio* in Mexico.<sup>5</sup>

"At Chilili, the chief pueblo of the Tampiros," writes Shea, "Father Juan de Salas founded a mission which soon had six churches and residences. His zeal extended beyond the limits of that nation. Hearing of the Jumanos, a tribe similar in mode of life to the tribes already known, whose pueblo lay east of the mesa, still bearing their name, the missionary about 1623 endeavored to bear the light of the Gospel to them. To his surprise he found the Jumanos familiar with Christian Doctrine, and they declared that they had been instructed by a woman. Her attire, as they described it, was that of a nun, and the missionary showed them a picture of Sister Louisa Carrion, a religious in Spain highly esteemed for her sanctity. The Indians declared that the dress was the same, but the lady who visited them was younger and more handsome. When Father Benavides subsequently returned to Spain, he heard of Sister Maria de Agreda, and at her convent learned that she had in ecstasy visited New Mexico and instructed the Indians there. In 1629 he resolved to found a mission among these interesting people, and sent Fathers Perea and Lopez to take up their residence at the great pueblo of the Jumano nation which he dedicated to St. Isidore, Archbishop." The chief pueblo spoken of here, in all probability, is thought by some persons to be *La Gran Quivira*.<sup>6</sup>

Father Benavides, in his *Memorial*, states how these two padres were filled with wonder and surprise when they saw the Jumano Indians approach them bearing two crosses. They removed their own crucifixes, and everyone came forward and devoutly kissed the image of the crucified Christ, and they also pressed their lips to the medal of the Infant Jesus which the padres wore. It is said that the num-

<sup>5</sup> *Memorial sobre el descubrimiento de Nuevo Mexico*—In Pacheco, Doc. xvi, pp. 188-227; Villagra, Gaspar: *Historia de la Nueva Mexico: Obediencia y Vasallaje a su Magestad por lo indios* (see *Traslado de la posesion*, pp. 108-117); in Pacheco, Doc. xvi., 88-141; Salmeron, Geronimo de Zarate: *Relaciones de N. Mexico*; Benavides, Alfonso: *Memorial*; *ibid.*: *Requete remonstrative au Roy d'Espagne sur la conversion du Nouveau Mexique*; Bonilla, Antonio: *Apuntes sobre Nuevo Mexico*; Calle, Juan Diaz: *Memorial y Noticias Sacras*; Vetancurt, Augustin: *Chronica de la Prov. del Sto. Evangelio de Mexico*; *ibid.*: *Menologio Franciscano*.

<sup>6</sup> Shea, John Gilmary: *The Catholic Church in Colonial Days*; *ibid.*: *History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, vol. I; *ibid.*: *History of the Catholic Missions Among the Indian Tribes of the United States*; Perea, Estevan de: *Verdadera Relacion de la Grandiosa Conversion que ha auido en el Nuevo Mexico*; Posadas, Celonso: *Informe*;—In Duro, Fernandez: *Don Diego de Penaloza*. (See also Schmidt, Edmond, J. P.: *Ven. Maria Jesus de Agreda*): *A Correction*; Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Assoc., vol. I, pp. 121-123.

ber of Indians present on this occasion was over ten thousand persons. Father Juan de Salas, the first missionary to the Jumano nation, was there also to witness this solemn spectacle. He preached to them the truths of Christianity, and at the end of his sermon he asked them if they all desired baptism. To test their earnestness for the acceptance of the Catholic Faith, they were asked to hold up their hands. The scene that met his eyes, when they all responded, deeply touched this apostolic missionary, so that he spent several days instructing them in doctrine and in prayer. The chieftain, as the padres were about to depart, sought supernatural aid for the sick, and many miraculous cures took place as a result of the blessings bestowed by these holy men of God. Again Fathers Juan de Salas and Ortego visited the Jumano nation in 1632, and found them very favorably disposed to accept Christianity.

In 1630, Father Benavides was sent by the *comisario general* to Spain to lay before the king the consoling results of the missions and to urge upon him the necessity of forming a bishopric in New Mexico, for the reason that distance and lack of communication with the episcopal authorities were insurmountable barriers for the exercise of competent jurisdiction. No prelate was authorized to administer the rites of Confirmation, nor had the power been delegated to anyone. He showed to the sovereign that at that time there were about fifty friars taking care of the spiritual interests of over sixty thousand Christianized natives. These were scattered in ninety or more pueblos, grouped in twenty-five missions, or *conventos*, as they were called. Each pueblo was supplied with its own church.

While in Spain, Benavides investigated the supernatural visits of Venerable Maria of Agreda, and learned from the lips of the saintly abbess herself that she had been transported in spirit to the Jumano nation by the heavenly host of angels to preach the Gospel to that people. The contemporary writers of the period are of one accord that this saintly nun, in an ecstatic state visited Texas and New Mexico,\* and instructed the Indians as early as 1620.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Op. cit. supra (5).

\* Dr. Herbert Eugene Bolton, in endeavoring to fix the home of this nation, states: "The history of the Jumano before 1650 it is not my purpose to discuss, but for the sake of clearness, it may be briefly summarized. The tribe was first seen by Cabeza de Vaca in 1535 on the Rio Grande near the junction of the Conchos River, a place known as La Junta (the junction); in 1582 they were found in the same place by Espejo; in 1598 they were receiving religious instruction in eastern New Mexico; for several years before 1629 they visited Fray Juan de Salas at Isleta, asking him to go and live among them; in response to this request, Father Salas, in the year named, visited the tribe more than one hundred and twelve leagues to the eastward of Santa Fe; in 1632, they were



Fathers Letrado and Arvide also toiled among the Jumanos, and later at Zuni, the former was killed by the gentile Zipias in February, 1632. Father Francisco Porras, at Moqui, was poisoned on June 28, 1633, and God was pleased to work many miracles through him.

A revolt occurred in 1644 in which the governor and many friars were killed. In 1645, in the time of Governor Arguello, about forty natives were flogged, imprisoned and hanged, because they refused to give up the Faith. During Concha's rule, about 1650, there was a plot in which Tehuas and the Apaches conspired to kill the soldiers and the friars on Thursday night of Holy Week, when all would be at church, but by chance the whole treacherous scheme was discovered by Captain Vaca, so that a great catastrophe was thereby averted.\*

In 1659, Father Garcia de San Francisco de Zuniga with two other priests came to El Paso to begin the difficult work of converting the Indian tribes of the vicinity, who seemed more intractable and unmanageable than any with whom the padres had hitherto had experience. The missionaries, in the face of all these obstacles and discouragements, were undaunted in their resolve to plant Christianity there.

Finally, after nine years of arduous labor, impressing civilization and the Catholic religion on the natives, the building of the church of Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe was undertaken. A *presidio* was built near El Paso for the sake of protection from hostile tribes, and it was consolidated with the Mission Gaudalupe, so that the padres themselves would also be free from the attacks of the savages.

The Apaches were, perhaps, the most troublesome of the Indian nations living near the Rio Grande. In 1672 they raided six pueblos, and in these encounters, several of the friars lost their lives. Again in 1675, many natives had to be thrown into prison for they had killed several missionaries and other Spaniards. In 1676 the condition of affairs was reported to be even more serious. It must be remembered

---

again visited by Father Salas in the buffalo plains on a stream which the Spaniards called the Nueces." (The Humano Indians, 1650-1771, by Herbert E. Bolton in Southwestern Historical Quarterly, vol. 15, pp. 68-69.)

\* Calle, Juan Diaz: *Memorial y Noticias Sacras*, p. 103; Pino, Pedro B.: *Noticias Historicas*, p. 2; *ibid.*: *Exposicion Sacinto*, p. 5; Barreiro, Antonio: *Ojeada sobre Nuevo Mexico*, pp. 5-6; Allegre, F. X.: *Historia de la compania de Jesus*, vol. I, p. 327; Ilzarbe, Joaquin: *Informe del P. Provincial* (See Pinart Collection); Bonilla, Antonio: *Apuntes sobre N. Mexico*;—*In N. Mexico Cedula*.

that the defensive force was only five men for each frontier station, and these were very sadly in need of arms and horses.<sup>9</sup>

Father Francisco Ayeta, the *custos*, sought to improve the conditions of the missionaries by providing a wagon train of supplies. He also made an earnest appeal to the royal treasury for fifty soldiers and a thousand horses to accompany the train. The expenses of providing for the missions in a material way amounted to fourteen thousand seven hundred pesos. The viceroy referred these financial considerations to the king, who approved of the entire proposal, and gave his royal assent on June 18, 1678, five days after it had been presented. A series of delays prevented the supply train from leaving the city of Mexico until the last day of September, 1679.

In the meantime, one of the most terrible Indian conspiracies, enflaming the passions and hatred of the Indians, was incited, and the massacres that followed immediately on the first outbreak of hostility began the war of extermination. What a frightful scene of tragedy and desolation here presented itself as the fugitive settlers and missionaries hastened eastward and outward to Isleta and El Paso, pursued by the savage horde of natives, thirsty for the blood of the Spaniards. The relief of Padre Ayeta came too late to prevent the abandonment of the provinces, but the supplies did furnish protection and encouragement at a time when disaster seemed most certain, and when death, in the form of myriads of hideous and grim savages, hovered near these temporary havens of safety.

One of the leading instigators of this Pueblo Revolt of 1680 was Popé, who influenced the various tribes to unite to annihilate the Spaniards. The arrogance of the soldiers, colonists and secular authorities in contrast with the peaceful and persuasive efforts used by the missionaries in settling difficulties, was chiefly responsible for the catastrophe that followed. The treatment of the natives by the soldiers cannot be characterized as other than cruel and inhuman.

<sup>9</sup> White, Owen: *Out of the Desert, the Historical Romance of El Paso*; Chapter I; Medina, Baltasar: *Cronica de la Santa Provincia de San Diego de Mexico*; Benavides, Alonso: *Memorial* (See Lummis: *Land of Sunshine*, vol. 13, pp. 281); Vetancourt, Augustin: *Menologio Franciscano*, pp. 24, 429; *ibid.*: *Cronica del Santo Evangelio de Mexico*, p. 98; *Petition of the citizens of New Mexico to the viceroy*, August 26, 1685. In *Autos sobre los Socorros* (Bolton collection); *Auto de Fundacion de la mision de Nuestra Senora de Gaudalupe de los Mansas del Paso del Norte*; In *libro Primero de Casamientos El Paso del norte*, fol. 74-75 (See Bandelier Collection); *Auto of Otermin in Auttos tocantes*, fol. 77; *Doc. Hist. Nuevo Mexico*, p. 746, (Bancroft Collection); Arlequi, Joseph: *Cronica de la Provincia de San Francisco de Zacatecas*, pp. 95-96; Ayeta, Francisco: *Carta*, Dec. 20, 1680 in *Doc.*; *ibid.*: *Memorial ad Virey, In New Mexico Doc.*, p. 481; Hughes, Anne: *Spanish Settlement in the El Paso District*, pp. 303-315, (*Early Missions and Settlers in the El Paso District, 1659-1680*).

These outrages were perpetrated against the king's expressed orders and the indignant protests of the padres. The aggravation of the Indians was, therefore, the more pronounced, because the pleadings of the kind and the just were of no avail in the face of obstinate, cruel and tyrannical practices of the Spaniards as a whole. When admonitions failed the Indians began to realize that only by concerted effort could they hope to shake off the shackles of their fiendish oppressors.

The date of August 13, 1680, was fixed as the day for the surprise attack everywhere. These hours of anxiety, before and after, are the most memorable ones in the annals of the Southwest. Note the grim determination of its leaders. A knotted cord was the mysterious signal used by Popé to warn his captains among the tribes. This most cunning secrecy was employed by him so that those suspected of friendship towards the Spaniards might be carefully excluded from the plot. No woman knew of the conspiracy, and Popé even killed his own son-in-law because of the suspicion of treachery. In spite of these of these precautions taken, the Tanos of San Lazaro and San Cristobal revealed the plot to Padre Bernal, the *custos*. Padre Velasco of Pecos was advised by some of his neophytes, and the alcade of Taos sent word to the Governor. Otermin dispatched swiftly, in all directions, messengers, like so many Paul Reveres, to warn the padres and settlers to flee to Isleta.

The darkening clouds of the Indian revolt burst into the most violent storm that has ever witnessed within the limits of what now constitutes the United States. On the 10th of August, three days before the time set, the terrible onslaught in blood and fire, began. Many fugitives escaped almost destitute from their homes, and traveled on foot to Isleta. Those who tarried, were killed on the spot, or hunted down and exterminated. Twenty-one padres,\* the lingering pastors of their dispersing flocks, hoped to save the remainder of their bewildered sheep, but all in vain. God rewarded their courage and their devotion to the faithful by martyrdom. No friend or foe, young or old, man or woman, was spared, except a few beautiful women and girls which they kept as captives.

\* Vetancourt gives the names of the martyrs with biographical information. The list of friars is as follows: Juan de Bal, Juan Bernal, Jose Espeleta, Jose Figueroa, Juan Bautista, Juan de Jesus, Francisco Antonio Lorenzana, Lucas Maldonado, Juan Montesdeoca, Antonio Mora, Luis Morales, Juan Pedrosa, Matias Rendon, Antonio Sanchez, Augustin Santa Maria, Juan Talaban, Manuel Tinoco, Tomas Torres, Jose Trujillo, Fernando Velasco, Juan Domingo Vera. Their distribution in the pueblos has already been partly recorded earlier by the author. Those padres who survived are as follows: Jose Bonilla, Francisco Gomez de la Cadena, Andres Duran, Francisco Farfan, Nicolas Hurtado, and Juan Zavalita.

The Indians, in their blind fury, could not distinguish between the troublesome and offending soldiers and civilians, and the gentle, meek, sacrificing and kind men of God. All were slain by these same grim reapers frenzied by passion, by enmity, and by a savage thirst for blood. The number of victims of this most terrible human sacrifice and carnage was over four hundred persons. About nineteen hundred and fifty escaped, and among these latter were eleven missionaries.<sup>10</sup>

The siege of Santa Fé lasted five days. A small group of men withstood a large army of natives over three thousand strong. The church and convent of the Franciscans were burned, and all then seemed lost. The last desperate sortie by the Spaniards, on the 20th of the month, under Governor Otermin, was very successful. By imploring the assistance of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the men were strengthened in courage, and dashed into the conflict with the besiegers, whom they threw back with frightful loss. Three hundred Indians were killed and forty-five others were taken captives. These were marched to the plaza, where they were shot by the Spaniards. In this engagement, only five of the governor's men were killed, but he and several others were wounded.

The stinging defeat of the sullen natives had the effect of maddening them for retaliation and revenge. To continue in the beleaguered villa would be fatal to the Spaniards. Hence the governor gave orders to the inhabitants to move to Isleta. The exodus, consisting of the garrison, men, women and children, about one thousand persons in all among whom were three friars, Padres Cadena, Duran and Farfan, began the painful march on foot through hostile territory. Each person carried his own luggage as the horses were barely strong enough to transport the sick and the wounded.

The dismal line of march was sufficient to disturb the morale of the most brave and to test the endurance and patience of hardened

<sup>10</sup> *Carta de Otermin a Parraga, in Auttos tocantes*, p. 31; *Carta de Ayeta al Virrey*, (Sept. 1, 1680, in *N. Mexico Doc. I*, p. 526); Bancroft, Hubert Howe: *Arizona and N. Mexico*, p. 171; *Report of Ayeta to the Junta General*, (Jan. 9, 1681) in *Auttos tocantes*, p. 107; *Proceedings of the Junta General* in *ibid.*, p. 114; Hackett, Charles Wilson: *The Retreat of the Spaniards from N. Mexico in 1680 and the Beginnings of El Paso*, in *Quarterly of Texas Hist. Assoc.*, pp. 137-168; Hughes, Anne: *Op. cit.*; Robles, Antonio: *Diario de los anos 1665 y 1703 in Doc. Hist. Mex.* 1st Ser. v. 2; Thoma, Francisco de: *Historia Popular de Nuevo Mexico*; Villagutierrez, y Sotomayor: *Historia de la Conquista*; Twitchell, Ralph Emerson: *Leading Facts of New Mexican History*; Davis, W. W. H.: *Spanish Conquest of New Mexico*, p. 297; Escalante, Silvestre Velez: *Carta de 1776 in Doc. para la Historia de Mexico, Tercera serie*; Bonilla, Antonio: *Apuntes sobre el Nuevo Mexico in New Mexico Cedulae*. (Bancroft Collection).

veterans. The route, which was by Santo Domingo, presented many gruesome sights of utter desolation, ruin, and death. At that place were found the bodies of three padres cruelly murdered, and the five soldiers, placed to defend them there, met a similar fate. The pueblos of San Felipe and Sandia had been sacked and all vestiges of Christianity had been destroyed. All the grossest examples of cruelty and the vilest and most inhuman tortures were employed. Padres Jesus Morador of Jemes was taken from bed, bound on a hog's back, and with blows of the scourge goaded on amid the jeers and yells of savages, afterwards ridden and spurred, till he fell dead. At Acoma, Padres Maldonado, Figueroa and Mora were tied together, and marched naked through the streets with abuse and insult of every kind. Figueroa, in open defiance of his tormentors, predicted their own untimely deaths. This did not restrain the persecutors, who, in demoniacal fury hurled clubs and stones at these martyrs until they expired.

There is a tradition that the people of San Felipe remained faithful to Christ, and that they saved the life of the padre in a neighboring pueblo. He, in turn, miraculously saved his own flock perishing from thirst, because the water supply had failed. He prayerfully opened a vein in each arm from which water flowed in copious and satisfying streams.

It is related that Fray Alonzo Gil appeared at the window of a mission church, where the fleeing Christians had taken temporary refuge from the fearful attacks of the natives. He stood there pleading with and trying to appease the rebels, but was pierced by an arrow.

Padre Arlegui, in his *Cronica*, states that Father Gil and some Spaniards were besieged in the church at Senecu. "The priest, on appearing at the window with a crucifix in his hand in the attempt to pacify the natives, was shot in the breast with an arrow, from the effects of which he died shortly afterwards at the foot of the crucifix in the altar." (Cited from Hackett: *Retreat of the Spaniards from New Mexico in 1680. Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association*, vol. 16, p. 148.) At Quivira, of the seventy padres distributed among the Indians, only two escaped violent death at the hands of the natives. (See James H. Carlton's story in *Smithsonian Institution Report* 1854, p. 313).

At Taos the Indians, assisted by their allies, the Apaches, attacked the settlers and the missionaries and only two escaped the frightful slaughter. A similar massacre occurred at Picuris, where no one was spared. The churches in both pueblos were burnt. At



Tesuque occurred the martyrdom of Father Pio. He had started out from Santa Fé in company with a soldier, named Pedro Hidalgo, to say mass at this pueblo, but when he reached there, the natives had just deserted it and were marching towards the mountains. With speed he finally overtook the entire tribe, whom he found painted in the most hideous war colors. Approaching the band, he boldly exclaimed: "What does this mean, my children, are you crazy? Do not disquiet yourselves, for I will aid you." He then pressed forward quickly to turn back the vanguard, for he still had in mind to celebrate Mass. He was grabbed by two Indians in a bushy ravine, and they came forth later smeared and gory with his blood. Father Pio made the supreme sacrifice for the cause of religion.

At Nambe, Fray Tomas de Torres was reported among the slain, and at San Juan the martyr priest, Father Juan de Morales, gave his life in the performance of his religious duties. At Galisteo, among the Tanos Indians, the first mentioned among the several persons killed were Father Antonio and Fray Domingo de Bera; and not so far from the pueblo Fray Fernando Velasco and Fray Manuel Tinoco shared similar fates at the hands of the merciless executioners. In their wild orgies, these blood-thirsty Indians profaned everything sacred, and the apostates would tear from their own necks the rosaries they wore, and would cast them in fiendish madness into the fire. They would then massacre the faithful Christians, and burn their churches. At Pecos, the name of Fray Juan de Pedrosa was specifically mentioned as having received a martyr's crown. At Santo Domingo, the first to meet death by the actions of the infuriated mob were three padres found in the convent. They were attacked by the Indians, insulted, dragged from their retreat to the nearby church. Here all three were piled in a heap where their decaying bodies were found a few days later by the refugees from Santa Fé. A recent writer makes the following splendid commentary of this particular event: "It is doubtful if there could have been for the padres a sweeter death, a grander sepulchre, or a crown of martyrdom quite so coveted or so glorious, as that which they earned for themselves while defending the Holy Faith in the Convent of Santo Domingo on San Lorenzo day." (Cited from *Revolt of Pueblo Indians of New Mexico in 1680*, by Charles Wilson Hackett in *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, v. 15, p. 123.)

In this darkest hour, when all were suffering of hunger and want, and when munitions and horses were sorely needed as a protection and safety against their inexorable enemies, Father Ayeta's wagon train of supplies was a veritable godsend to the refugees. The camps

and the incoming hordes of fugitives would have perished, and the defense at El Paso would have been impossible, had not the padre *Comisario* placed the goods intended for the missionaries as relief for all.

But further provision was necessary in the perplexing situation that here presented itself. At the end of the year, Father Ayeta went again to Mexico City with a new petition for relief, and in this mission he was singularly successful. Missionary reinforcements and supplies were also needed. On March 20, 1681, he went to the Convent of San Francisco. Here, after a full report of the misfortunes had been related, a religious service in memory of the martyrs took place, and on this occasion, Fray Sarinana preached a most eloquent and touching sermon. Ayeta then returned to the mission field as *comisario* and still in charge of the royal interests. Again his relief and good tidings cheered the hearts of all. El Paso, near the temporary camp of San Lorenzo, was made the supply station and headquarters for the reconquest and protection of New Mexico.<sup>11</sup>

In the sporadic uprisings that happened during the period of restoration and rehabilitation of the Spanish colonists, these incursions by separate tribes were many. Due to a lack of confidence, the natives of all pueblos were slow to yield, until by mild persuasion they were induced by Vargas, the governor, and the friars who aegovernment. This *entrada* ended without the loss of a drop of blood, accompanied him, to return to their allegiance, both in religion and in

<sup>11</sup> Otermin, Antonio: *Extractos de Doc. Hist. N. Mex. in N. Mexico, Doc. Hist.* 1153-1728 (a copy of MS. in Bancroft Collection); here are also to be found (pp. 514-81) important letters written by the friars at El Paso, August-December, 1680; Vetancurt, Augustin: *Cronica de la Provincias del Sto. Evangelio de Mexico*; *ibid.*: *Menologio Franciscano*, valuable for information before the revolt and on the friars who were martyred. He says the Pueblo Revolt was foretold six years in advance by a girl miraculously raised from the dead, who said it was due to prevalent lack of respect for the padres. (See *Cronica*, pp. 103-104, and *Menologia*, p. 113; Escalante Silvestre Velez: *Carta in Arch. N. Mexico*; Davis, W. H. H. *Spanish Conquest of N. Mexico*; Niel, Juan A.: *Apuntamientos*, in *Doc. Hist. Mex.* 3rd. Ser. iv. pp. 103; Villagutierrez y Sotomayor: *Historia de la Conquista*; Davila, Juan G.: *Memorias Historicas*, pt. II, pp. 1 and 2; Cavo Andres: *Tres Siglos de Mexico*, II, pp. 57-60; Villaseñor y Sanchez, Jose A.: *Theatro Americano*, II, p. 419; Mange, Juan M.: *Historia de la Pimeria Alta in Doc. Hist. Mex.* 4th Series, I, p. 226; Lezaun, Juan S.: *Noticias lamentables acaecidas en la N. Mex., Doc.* p. 128, et. seq.; Arrievita, J. D.: *Cronica Serafica*, p. 199; Arlegin, Jove: *Cronica de la Prov. de Zacatecas*, pp. 249-50; Signenza y Gongora: *Mercurio Volante*, p. 589, et. seq.; Espinosa, Isidoro: *Cronica Seraphica*, p. 35; Prince L. Bradford: *Historical Sketches of N. Mexico*; Davis, W. H. H.: *El Gringo*, pp. 75-80, 134-7; Domeneek, E.: *Deserts of North America*; Hackett, Charles W.; *op. cit.*; Hughes, Anne: *op. cit.*; Bancroft, Hubert Howe: *Ariz. and N. Mex.*, chap. ix, 174, et. seq.

except with the Apaches. During the submission of these rebel pueblos, the friars had baptized two thousand, two hundred and fourteen children.

There were but few Spanish settlers in the north, and Vargas therefore petitioned the viceroy to supply more soldiers and families. About eight hundred persons set out from Mexico on the 13th of October, 1693, and with these came also seventeen friars under Padre Salvador de San Antonio as *custos*. Of these colonists, on account of lack of proper preparations, thirty died on the way from hunger and exposure.

The distribution of the friars was sought by some of the tribes, but Padre San Antonio had some concern about risking the lives of his missionaries rashly and needlessly to sure death. The petition of the friars protesting was signed by Padres San Antonio, Juan Zavaleta, Francisco Corvera, Juan Alpuente, Juan Antonio del Corral, Juan Munoz de Castro, Antonio Obregon, Juan Daza, Buenaventura Contreras, Antonio Carbonel, Jose Narvaez Valverde, Diego Zeinos, Francisco de Jesus Maria Casañes, Geronimo Prieto, Antonio Bahamonde, Domingo de Jesus Maria and Jose Diez. The governor listened to the advices and opinions of the friars and did not urge the to scatter into the pueblos until peaceful relations with the tribes had become well established.

In 1695-6 crop failure and famine unsettled the conditions of both the natives and colonists. According to one authority—"people were forced to live on dogs, cats, horses, mules, bull hides, foul herbs and old bones; finally they roamed over the fields like wild animals."

The custodian of the friars was in a position to know the feeling of general uneasiness and the real sentiments of the natives. The imminent danger of a new revolt was predicted in a communication to Vargas on March 7th. He pointed out the lack of defense of the various missions and asked as a protection, a suitable guard of soldiers sufficient to cope with the dangers, so that a disaster similar to that of 1680 might be avoided.

This was followed on the 13th and 22nd with two more petitions, giving notice that the Indians had already committed outrages in the new temples. Some of the missionaries were allowed to leave their posts and to go to Santa Fé for safety. In his reports of Vargas to the viceroy, he touched on the imaginary dangers, and these misrepresentations were regarded by the friars as imputations of cowardice. All returned to their stations, and were ready for the crisis, which they knew was close at hand. On the 4th of June, sev-

eral nations arose. Five missionaries and twenty-one Spaniards were killed and the abandonment of pueblos quickly followed. The padres who suffered martyrdom were Fathers Arbiza of San Cristobal, Carbonel of Taos, Corvera of San Ildefonso, Moreno of Nambe, and Casañes of Jemes. Corvero and Moreno were shut up in a cell of the convent at San Ildefonso and burned to ashes with the building kindled by the natives. According to Espinosa, the chronicler, Padre Casañes at Jemes, foreseeing that he was about to meet his fate, asked the Indians to let him die embracing the foot of a certain cross. While about to make a sick call, he was led into ambush by the Apaches, who stoned and clubbed him to death at his chosen spot. Espinosa, in giving an account of his life, mentions—"his miraculous transportation by an angel on mule back to visit unknown Texas tribes." The surviving Franciscans of Queretero province left the country in 1696.<sup>12</sup>

This last decade of the seventeenth century coincides also with the opening period of missionary activities in Texas, and therefore a brief discussion of exploration there is necessary as a background to subsequent events. It must be noted here, by way of introduction, that more than a century and a half had elapsed since the original occupation by the Spaniards before the first *entrada* was made into Texas and in the meantime there were happenings that aroused to action the royal government in Spain and the viceroys, the ruling power in Mexico. Long and disastrous experience with the Indians in New Mexico and elsewhere had made the friars more cautious to seek always the presidio and its garrison as a guard and a protection for the neophytes, the settlers, the padres and the missions themselves. This became gradually to be regarded as the Spanish system of colonization everywhere, and was supported and improved by new enactments in the laws by the council of the Indies. These outposts of civilization dotted the northern frontier provinces of new Spain on both sides of the Rio Grande, and proved a barrier against foreign oppression and occupation and also were some hindrance to alien trade and compacts with the Indians, detrimental to the interests of the Spanish regimes. It was unlike English methods, and after

<sup>12</sup> Davis, W. H. H.: *Spanish Conquest of the Southwest*, pp. 336, et. seq.; Sigüenza y Gongora Carlos: *Mercurio Volante in N. Mex. Doc. Hist.*, pp. 581-661; Escalante, Silvestre Velez: *Carta*, pp. 123-4; Sigüenza y Gongora Carlos: *Carta al Admirante*, pp. 6-7; Vargas, Diego: *Reconquista d N. Mex.* pp. 118-24 in *Arch. Sta. Fe.*; Robles, Antonio: *Diario de los anos*, 117; Davis, W. H. H.: *Spanish Conquest of N. Mexico*, p. 142-3; Petition of the friars in *Arch. N. Mexico*, p. 142-3; Espinosa: *Cronica Seraphica*, pp. 176, 199-200; Escudero, Jose A.: *Noticias Estadisticas de Sonora*.

the practice of American appropriation of the soil and the exploitation of the natives, whom they pushed always farther and farther westward to make room for the settlement of the ever-increasing hordes of new colonists from Europe. The Spaniards, on the contrary, took a more humane attitude with the Indians and attempted to unite these darker races of God's creation with themselves and to mold therefrom a new nation and a new people.\*

The opening pages of Texas history are full of tragedy. The ill-fated Narvaez expedition in 1528, although not an organized missionary undertaking, was carried on by Catholic pioneer explorers. Accompanying these first voyagers by sea from Mexico, was a motley throng of adventurers, and perhaps prospective colonists. Padre Juan Juarez, Fray de Palos and the other Franciscan missionaries that came with them perished on the southeastern shore of Texas, when the storm-tossed small vessel in which they were sailing, capsized with the loss of all on board. The painful wanderings of Cabeza de Vaca and three other survivors up and down the Southwest was the first advancement of Christians into this land of mystery, peopled by savages who regarded the strangers as a messenger sent to them from the Almighty and Divine Being. They were respected as persons gifted with supernatural power to heal and to cure those deathly sick. Cabeza de Vaca, in his *Relaciones*, gives many cases of Indians who were restored to health by the mere imposition of hands.<sup>13</sup>

---

\* Historians, sociologists, ethnologists, are now in agreement that the treatment of the North American Indians at the hands of the English and American people has been a heartless policy of actual extermination. In 1908, the United States, through the Indian Bureau, acknowledged the utter failure of the government in solving the racial problems involved. In contrast, the Spanish system, which was a success, was acknowledged, approved, and highly recommended.

<sup>13</sup> *Relation of Cabeza de Vaca* (see English translation by Buckingham Smith entitled: *Narrative of Alvar Nunez Cabeza de Vaca*, with memoir and appreciation of Smith's work by Dr. John Gilmary Shea. This edition contains portraits of the Franciscan padres, Fray Juan Xuarez and Fray Juan de Palos; *Carta de Cabeza de Vaca*, 1536, in Oviedo G. Hernandez de: *Historia General de las Indias*, lib. 35, Chap. 1-7, pp. 582-618; *Naufragios de Alvar Nunez Cabeza de Vaca* in Barcia; *Historidores Primitivos de las Indias Occidentales*; See also reprint in *Biblioteca de Autores Espanoles*; Bancroft, H. H.: *North Mexican States and Texas*, I; Winsor, Justin: *Narrative and Critical History of America*, II. (See Dr. John Gilmary Shea: *Ancient Florida*). Coopwood, Bethel: *Route of Cabeza de Vaca in Quarterly Texas State Hist. Assoc.* III; pp. 108-140, 177-288, 229-264, IV, 1-3. See also X, pp. 246-279, 308-340; Davenport, Harbert: *Expedition of Narvaez by Oviedo*, (see Quarterly V., 27-28; Ribas, Andre Perez de: *Historia de los Triunfos*, pp. 24-26; Beaumont, Pablo: *Cronica* IV, 73-8; Herrera, Antonio de: *Historia General*, dec. iv., lib. iv., cap. v-vi; dec. vi., lib. I, cap. III-VII; Gleeson, W.: *History of the Catholic Church in California*, I, pp. 45-64.



For one hundred and fifty years before the Spaniards definitely attempted to settle this territory they gradually explored it. We may therefore pass over Moscoso and the survivors of the De Soto Expedition in 1542, and that of Father Olmos in 1544. Mere mention need only be made also of the landing of Bazares on Texas soil at Matagorda Bay in 1558.

The increasing territorial limits of the Spanish realm caused by these explorations and discoveries were regarded by certain mother countries in Europe with jealous eyes. The French sovereign and foreign traders were very covetous for lands possessed by the Spaniards in the New World. The La Salle project was an attempt to appropriate valuable lands in the basin of the Mississippi River at its mouth. The strategic importance of this French objective for commercial rivalry and for wider colonization was well estimated. The encroachment of that people upon the lands of their chief competitors, the Spaniards, was but the matter of time. La Salle revealed for the first time the object of his enterprise, when he landed at Matagorda Bay in February, 1685.

Several priests, who had accompanied him on his voyage, had come for the conquest of souls, and were therefore deceived by him. Among this group were three Franciscans, Fathers Zenobius Membre, Anastasius Douay, and Maximus La Clerq. Three Sulpicians also came for missionary purposes; Fathers John Cavelier de la Salle, Chefdeville, and D'Emansville. The last named priest returned to France in disgust, for he said he came to war against demons and not Christians.

La Salle made several attempts to reach the Mississippi River. He finally arranged a select party of followers, who, on account of their excellent physical condition, would assist him in gathering forces and supplies when they reached their destination. About twenty or more were left behind at Fort St. Louis, which had been built before the departure of La Salle, as a protection for those that remained. These forsaken ones were prevented by sickness, accidents, and other misfortunes from making the journey. Three priests stayed with them to comfort and console them, Fathers Membre, Le Clerq, and Chefdeville. Fathers La Salle and Douay went with the expedition that was never to return, for the great explorer was murdered on the way. The fate of those at fort was even more tragic. They were massacred by the savages. When the Spanish arrived on their first expedition, into Texas, they found only the burnt and charred ruins

of the fort and the unburied and scattered human remains of priests and laymen.<sup>14</sup>

Clark graphically describes the sad conditions of things taken principally from the *Derrotero* of Captain Leon, the military leader of the first *entradas*: "All there was deserted and silent. About the yard were scattered the contents of the plundered houses, broken chests and boxes and barrels, broken tackle of a ship; a great number of books with leaves torn and scattered, but bearing still the evidences of costly bindings; and broken cutlasses, and the stocks of many arquebuses with locks and barrels gone. On the prairie nearby lay three dead bodies, one of which, from the fragment of a dress that still clung to it, appeared to be that of a woman. The village consisted of five or six small houses or palisades, plastered over with mud, and covered with skins of buffaloes; a larger house where apparently animals were kept, and a wooden fort, made from the timbers of a wrecked vessel. The fort had four lower rooms, one of which had served as a chapel, and above these rooms was an upper story which had been used as a storeroom."

Clark thus tells the story of the destruction of Fort St. Louis and its little colony: "Before the final catastrophe, the smallpox had broken out among the villagers, reducing their number till there were scarcely more than a score left. La Salle had gone away with the ablest of the men on a last toilsome journey in search of the "fatal river." Day by day the few men, women and children, left upon the shore of Bay St. Louis, waited while hope slowly failed them. Around them was the unending wilderness, pathless and inhospitable; before them stretched a waste of sand beyond which spread out the wide tantalizing sea. Near the first of February, in the year 1689, the end came. They had been on friendly terms with the Indians, and consequently suspected no evil. The savages came and went about the village, bartering for trinkets, and professing friendship. Soon all of the people of the village, willing to accept any diversion to pass the tedious days, came out and gathered around the savages watching curiously their actions. A band of warriors then rushed up from the river, where they had been concealed, set upon the villagers and killed them all except five who were saved by an Indian woman. After massacring the inhabitants, the Indians plundered the huts and

<sup>14</sup> Parkman, Francis: *Discovery of the Great West*, pp. 302-402; Margry, Pierre: *Memoires et Documents pour servir a l'histoire des origines francaises des pays d'outre-mer*, vol. III; Joutel, Henri de: *Journal Historique*, (see Mayer, Miss); Le Clerq, Chretien: *Histoire des Colonies Francaises. Relation de Henri Joutel* (see Margy III, pp. 91-534; Translation in *Hist. Coll. of La.*, part I; Cavo, Andres: *Los Tres Siglos de Mexico*, II, pp. 70, et. seq.

the fort, breaking open the chests and scattering their contents, carrying away whatever they fancied, and breaking up what they could not use."

That the Spaniards were alarmed at the sudden occupation of Texas by the French is shown by the heroic efforts made in the frequent expeditions that followed one another in quick succession at the close of the seventeenth century.

About the time of this disastrous and bloody attack upon the remnants of La Salle's exploring party, the viceroy of Mexico, Conde de Paredes, Marques de Laguna, gave orders to the Marques de San Miguel de Aguayo, Governor of the new kingdom of Leon, to watch the movements of the French. A troop of cavalry, headed by Captain Alonso de Leon, accompanied by Father Manzanet, arrived at the Bahia de Espiritu Santo (Matagorda Bay) in 1689. This party was the first to penetrate the interior of Texas and they visited at that time the Tejas Indians, situated between the Trinity and the Neches Rivers. Here Manzanet met the chieftain of the nation on the banks of the Guadalupe, and received the encouragement to his missionary efforts that induced him to make a second *entrada* the following year. He was accompanied by Padres Miguel Fortecuberta, Francisco de Jesu Maria de Casanas, and Antonio Bordoy intent on the establishment of a mission in the midst of the savage wilderness, and in this place, four hundred miles from the nearest settlement, the three friars volunteered to remain.

The mission received the name of San Francisco de los Tejas from which the state derived its name. The intense suffering and want of these and the subsequent pilgrimages beggars all description. The third *entrada* was very extensively planned under the military leadership of Don Domingo Teran de los Rios, Governor of Coahuila and with Father Damian Manzanet as *comisario*. He was joined by the following Franciscans: Nicolas Prevo Miguel Garcia, Ildefonso Monge, Jose Soldano, Antonio Miranda, Juan Garaicoechea. On June 18, 1691, Father Manzanet received a letter through Indian messengers urging utmost haste as Mission San Francisco was in sore need of relief.

The expedition had succeeded in reaching the land of the Cadodachos, but only with the most painful trials and hardships. The unusual severity of the winter weather could just be borne through the greatest of human efforts. The wretched and unseasoned explorers and their company, amidst torrential rains and cold northerners, crossed dense forests and treacherous unbridged rivers, and were in

constant fear of Indian attacks. To make matters worse, difficulties were accentuated by a widening breach between Father Manzanet and Governor Teran.

The padres, with a few soldiers, set out promptly to bring succor to their needy brethren. When they reached San Francisco Mission, they learned of the death of Father Miguel Fortecuberta. With his two companions, he had toiled day and night attending to the fever-stricken people. In a single month the sickness had carried off over three hundred persons, and during the course of the year, 1690-1691, three thousand victims of the disease died, most of them having received baptism. Father Fortecuberta, weakened by these perpetual administrations and cares, also fell a victim to his zeal and became a martyr of charity.

The savages attributed these numerous deaths as an evil omen, and despised the new religion. The spread of the Gospel became very difficult under these circumstances, and the padres, at last worn out with their labor, listened, with some apprehension, to the hostile threats of the Indians against the self-sacrificing missionaries themselves. Military protection was sought from the viceroy and when this was not provided, Father Manzanet, filled with disappointment, directed the Fathers to retire and to return to Mexico.

For twenty years, after the abandonment of San Francisco and Santa Maria missions, the savages were left without any spiritual comfort or ministrations.

"The little log church of San Francisco and its companion mission by the Neches," says Clark in his *Beginnings of Texas*, "although ephemeral and productive of no immediate good, in the larger outlook, were eminently worthwhile, for they served as an admonition and a warning when twenty years later, the friars came again to stretch their line of larger and more substantial churches from the Rio Grande to the Sabine."

The frequent wars between hostile tribes that roamed far and wide were the most menacing obstacles to missionary efforts. Father Hidalgo knew that all former endeavors, on the part of the padres, had met with indifference on the part of the viceroys and his court in Mexico. He therefore applied to Captain Luis de St. Denis, a French officer, for assistance and soldiers to protect the journey of the missionaries northward. The presence of St. Denis in Texas, four hundred miles inland on Spanish soil, caused the Mexican authorities to be awakened from their lethargy. They had dwelt in the false security that Texas could remain an unoccupied and untenanted wilderness as long as they saw fit to ignore the earnest requests of the friars.

To guard against any further unforeseen developments, the encroachments of Frenchmen on Spanish territory were offset by the re-establishment of the missions in Texas.

The military command of this new expedition was entrusted to Captain Domingo Ramon and many missionaries offered themselves for the field. The Father Guardian at Queretero selected the following volunteers: Fathers Hidalgo, Gabriel Vergera, Benito Sanchez, Manuel Castellanos and Pedro Prez de Mezquia. On reaching the Rio Grande, Padre Isidoro Espinosa was given instructions by the Father Guardian to accept the superiorship of the band. These were joined by another group of missionaries at San Juan Bautista who were awaiting the expedition. They were Fathers Matias Sanz de San Antonio, Pedro de Mendoza and Augustin Patro, under the care of the Venerable Father Antonio Margil,\* all of them of the missionary college of Our Lady of Guadalupe, Zacatecas. These two jurisdictions of Franciscans chose fields of labor apart from each other. The Fathers of Queretero re-established San Francisco de los Tejas on July 3, 1716. New foundations were made-Mission Purisima Concepcion among the Hasinais, Mission San Jose among the Nazonis. The Venerable Padre Margil established the Zacatecan missionaries at Mis-

---

\* The Venerable Antonio Margil, professed priest of the Friars Minor Observant of St. Francis, completely fulfilled the command of the Divine Master, when He told His Disciples, "Go into all of the world, preach the Gospel and teach ye all nations." For no sooner had he ended his novitate than he occupied himself wholly in spreading the Word of God. Being soon called to the missions in the Indies, he gladly received the Apostolic Ministry, and leaving the country, crossed the ocean. In the New World, he was not content to labor only in known parts, but penetrating to the farthest and most inaccessible parts, he visited unfriendly nations of savage tribes, speaking unknown tongues, barbarous in their cruelty, overwhelmed in the darkness of ignorance, given over to witchcraft and superstitions, idolators, everywhere preaching Christ, the true God, and traveling to teach them the commands of the Gospel and a more civilized manner of life. Trusting in God, the Venerable Antonio daily undertook the most arduous journeys, without scrip or purse or shoes; patiently suffering hunger and thirst and all manner of hardships; fearlessly enduring insults, bonds, arrows, the stake; oftentimes the danger of death, and thirsting after martyrdom, if only he might drag these wretched souls from the clutches of the devil and make them subject to Christ. Strengthened by the help of heaven, he brought many thousands of men, living aforetime like wild beasts, to religion and baptized them, destroyed the worship of false gods, did away with superstitions, broke up idols, and built chapels, mission houses, and colleges for the propagation of the Faith in the remotest regions. (From the *Apostolic Brief of Gregory*, XVI; quoted from Kerwin's *History of the Diocese of Galveston*, Chap. III, pp. 20-21, by Rt. Rev. Mgr. W. W. Hume, D. D.



sion Nuestra Senora de los Dolores among the Adays Indians and Mission San Miguel de los Adaes. (Now Robeline, Louisiana).<sup>15</sup>

"Almost from the beginning," writes Father Isidoro Espinosa,\* "the Fathers began to maintain themselves by the bread of tears and affliction. The first trouble occurred when seven of the twenty-five soldiers, who had been sent to guard the missions, deserted and abandoned us, at the same time taking along some of the animals destined for the use of the friars. After selecting the site for each mission, the missionaries assigned to them, had to construct their thatched dwellings unaided, and as no provision was forwarded, abstinence commenced on the first day. Although it was not the season of Lent, the meals consisted of nothing more than a purslane with salt and pepper. Once in a while the Indians would give us a little corn, a kind of beans, and some wild fruits, which served to divert, rather than to appease hunger. Rarely was a mouthful of meat obtained.

"The hardships endured by the missionaries in their great zeal will be better understood if we will bear in mind that the *ranchos* of the Indians lay far apart; that some of them were situated six and even seven leagues distant in every direction. Hence it was not an easy matter to visit the greater number of *ranchos* in one day, especially when it became necessary to remain a long time instructing

<sup>15</sup> Carta de Damien Manzanet. Derrolero de Alonso de Leon. Espinosa, Isidor: *Cronica Barcia*; *Ensayo Cronologica*; Margry, Pierre: *Memoires*; Cavo: *Los Tres Seglos*; Banilla: *Breve Compendio*; Bancroft, H. H.: *North Mex. States and Texas*, I; Villa Senor y Sanchez: *Theatro Americano*. For the third *entrada*, the chief document contains three parts: (1) Instructions given by the viceroy; (2) Diary of Governor Teran, and (3) Diary of Father Damien Manzanet, all to be found in *Documentos para historia Ecclesiastica y civil de la Provincia de Texas in Memorias de Nueva Espana*, V. 27. These three documents have been translated by Mrs. Austin Hatcher, Archivist, University of Texas, and will be printed soon as Preliminary Studies, Vol. I, No. I, of the Texas Catholic Historical Society now in the process of organization. Clark, R. C.: *The Beginnings of Texas in Quarterly of Texas State Historical Assoc.*, V. pp. 171. *Carta y Relacion de Fray Francisco de Jesus Maria al Conde de Salve*, Aug. 15, 1691, (the A. & M. Collection). Fourth *entrada* under Ramon (in *Memorias de Nueva Espana*, vol. 27), is translated and will appear later as Preliminary Study of Texas Catholic Hist. Soc.

\* The translation of Espinosa used here is quoted from Father Zepheryn Engelhardt, O. F. M., in a series of articles written for the *Franciscan Herald*, (1914-1917, inclusive), entitled "*Missionary Labors of the Franciscans Among the Indians of the Early Days*." Espinosa's *Chronicles* are one of the chief reliable sources of early Texas Catholic history because the author was one of the first missionaries sent to this country from the Colegio de Santa Cruz at Queretaro, Mexico. The records of the missionary work of the Franciscans for the later period were continued by Padre Juan Arrievita under the same title: *Cronica Seraphica y Apostolica*. A few excerpts are taken here and there to demonstrate the extreme hardships and wants under which these pioneer priests labored.

the dying, or persuading those in health not to prevent the the eternal salvation of the sick.

"The Fathers shed many tears for the conversion of the Indians. Particularly during the times of epidemics, the missionaries took pains to search the wretched hovels for dying children, and this opened the heavenly doors to a great many.

"For two years," Father Espinosa tells us, "the want and the hardships which the Fathers endured, were keenly felt, but it seems they were unavoidable. From the time the missionaries entered the country in 1716, no aid whatever reached them, and as supplies, which they brought along with them were very few, they soon gave out and were reduced to great straits.

"During the years 1717 and 1718, owing to the severity of the drought, the harvest of corn and beans among the Indians were very poor. As we usually received some provisions from the natives, it was inevitable that when they themselves suffered from want, we would also feel the pangs of hunger. Although we had written to the Colleges of Santa Cruz and Guadalupe, and although they had taken energetic steps to relieve our necessities, by appealing to the viceroy, His Excellency, the Marquis de Valera and the Royal Junta or Council could do no more than direct a governor to proceed at once with soldiers and provisions to Coahuila and Texas.

"I did not intend that, through my reports, the reputation of any officer be blackened, but it is certain that, in the year 1717, at the request of the Father Superior of the Rio Grande missions, a corporal and fifteen soldiers, accompanied by some friars, were dispatched to Texas in order to transport the supplies which His Excellency, the Viceroy, had provided with an open hand. Nevertheless, these supplies, which would have saved the whole province, remained forty leagues away in the desert, like a ship run aground, because the soldiers, who bore the provisions, were impeded in their march by the swollen water of the Trinity River, which had overflowed its banks for a distance of two leagues. The men waited until December, but as they noticed that the rains increased rather than diminished, and feared lest they themselves might perish, they left all the supplies on a little oak-sheltered hill and returned much discouraged to the Rio Grande del Norte. The friars, too, seeing that it was impossible to proceed, left a letter in the hands of some Texas Indians, who remained in that region to plant their fields, and directed them to deliver it as soon as the river would permit passage. This letter told where the provisions had been hidden, and where the mail sent to

us could be found. Of all this nothing was known to us in the missions until the month of July, 1718."

"Before relating what then took place," Father Espinosa continues, "I shall give a brief account of the miseries in which we found ourselves engulfed. In the first place, the daily bread, which, in this country is Indian corn, was wanting. If, perchance, after running through the *rancherías* a peck of corn was gathered, there was much ado about it as if a great train of provisions had arrived. The scarcity of grain prevented us from making as much as a *tortilla*. When, by chance, we could get a mouthful of meat, we boiled a handful of corn and this answered the purpose of bread. Salt was entirely wanting. Meat, in quantities, was not to be had at all, and even if, on rare occasions, some compassionate Indian brought us a bit of venison, the want of salt rendered it little agreeable to the taste. Many a day dawned when there was absolutely nothing to eat at hand.

"The burden of distress weighed most heavily on us not at the table, but at the altar. Like all our other supplies, the wax also gave out. Many days were spent putting together the stubs and the drippings until all the wax had disappeared. After that we had recourse to candles made of fat; but even here the quantity we could collect among the Indians, was so meager that even on days of obligation, we were obliged to celebrate Holy Mass with but one candle. The altar wine, too, became so scarce that only so much was put into the cruets as was absolutely necessary to make it lawful matter.

"In this extremity, the Lord sent us some assistance through the Venerable Father Antonio Margil, who was superior of the Guadalupe missions, thirty leagues or more farther east. He paid us a visit, and we learned that his missions suffered the same difficulties as our own, save that they possessed what was necessary for Holy Mass. As soon as the good Father had observed our lack of altar wine and wax, he jestingly confided to me that he, though an old man, had buried a bottle of wine to provide for the time of extreme necessity. When Father Margil, therefore, returned to his mission, he quickly sent us a quart bottle full of wine and a pound of wax. This we divided among the six priests, and thus, to our great consolation, we were enabled to celebrate Holy Mass again, sometimes during the week, and only on Sundays and holidays of obligation as heretofore."

Father Espinosa concluded by saying, "There were many hardships that were of a different nature which gave us ample opportunity of gaining merits during the two years, but these I leave to the imagination of the reader. I only hope that the Sovereign Father of us all has found it worth while to mark down in His records, what His

servants endured, and that He will compensate them on the Last Day."

Father Pedro Munoz of the Rio Grande missions felt a great deal of concern about the dire needs and the distress of the Texas missions. He feared that the savages must have discovered the supplies stowed away near the Trinity River, and consequently set out with fresh supplies of provisions to succor his starving brethren.

Fathers Espinosa and Margil, with their suffering companions in the missions, were ignorant of these cached goods until informed by messengers of the relief party. The letter of Father Muñoz was delivered on July 26, the friars embraced each other at the very place where the provisions were concealed.

Much belated news came to hand, but the most important information was the proposed settlement of whites on the San Antonio River. Authorization was also given by the viceroy and his council for the establishment of new missions between the San Antonio and Guadalupe Rivers. Interminable delays prevented the carrying out of the order of March 12, 1718. Finally Father Antonio de San Buenaventura y Olivares took matters into his own hands and obtained permission from the viceroy to transfer his mission of San Francisco de Solano from the south bank of the Rio Grande to the San Antonio River. Father Olivares may therefore be regarded as the founder of the Mission San Antonio de Valero, the Alamo, as it was called in later history. Five other missions were built in the course of time, the ruins of which are preserved to this day. Troubles with the French in east Texas, a temporary retreat to San Antonio, a return to those places so recently deserted, discouragement of the padres, the transfer of the Missions San Francisco, Purisima Concepcion and San José to San Antonio is the story briefly told of the living martyrs of Texas. The outstanding figure among all was the Venerable Father Margil who is regarded as the patron of this state, as Junipero Serra deserves to rank in California. Lives like these shine down the centuries with all the effulgence of that heavenly light which animated and illumed their saintly careers while on earth.

The Missions of San Antonio begot others in time. Father Arrievita relates: "On one of his apostolic journeys, Father Mariano Francisco de los Dolores Y Viana of Mission San Antonio discovered a large collection of Mayeyes, Yojuines, Deadoses, Vidais, and other savages near Rio San Xavier (San Gabriel) about midway between the Rio San Antonio and the abandoned missions on the Neches River. By means of the judicious use of gifts of tobacco that delighted especially the male Indians, and of sweets and trinkets that capti-

vated the females, Father Mariano soon found himself on friendly terms with the savages. After he had humored them sufficiently, he cautiously seized the opportunity of acquainting them with the object of his visit. At some length, and in the simplest terms, he spoke of the various points of Christian Doctrine, the necessity of knowing the Creator, and of doing what He commanded, of the eternal happiness of the soul in another world, and of the wretched condition of the damned."

The Indians later sent a delegation to Father Mariano asking him to establish missions in their midst. They belonged to other tribes who had no relation with those at San Antonio. They were, moreover, too far separated by distance to enjoy the ministrations of the friars, yet they wished to become Christians.

After years of persuasion by the natives and several petitions to the viceroy of Mexico by Mariano, the San Xavier missions were built. They were named San Xavier, San Ildefonso, and Candelario. A *presidio* with a garrison was also provided, but its management by Captain Rabago ruined the work of the padres because this officer led a very dissolute life, and gave public scandal by his misconduct.

Finally he tried to assassinate one of the Fathers who had tried to punish the offender by ecclesiastical censure. Father Ganzabal, as he appeared at the door of Mission San Ildefonso, was cruelly pierced by an arrow. Shortly after his death, the wrath of God descended on the place. Father Mariano, an eye-witness, thus describes the scene: "The sacrilegious homicide having been perpetuated, the elements at once conspired, declaring divine justice provoked, for in the sky appeared a ball of fire so horrible that all were terrified, and with so notable a circumstance that it circled from the *presidio* to the mission of the Ocoquiza, and returned to the same *presidio*, and then exploded with a noise as loud as could be made by a heavy cannon. The river ceased to run, and its waters became so corrupted that they were extremely noxious and intolerable to the smell. The air became so infected that all who went to the place, even though merely passing, became infected by the pest, which became so malicious that many of the inhabitants died, and we found ourselves in the last extremes of life. Finally the land became so accursed that what had been a beautiful plain, became converted into a thicket, in which opened horrible crevices that caused terror; and the inhabitants became put to it, in order to escape the complete extermination which threatened them that they moved more than thirty leagues away with no other



permission than that granted to them by the natural right to save their own lives."\*

The terrible phenomenon struck terror into the hearts of the Indians. They fled and the missions were completely deserted. It became necessary to move the equipment at San Xavier to the San Marcos River. Here the caravans stayed for a few months, but since the location was not acceptable to all concerned, a place at the origin of the Guadalupe River was chosen. At first no Indians came, but later on thousands appeared, but all efforts to detain them were of no avail. Colonel Diego Ortez Parillo, who was placed in command of the garrison, was convinced that the whole project was impossible. The mission on the Guadalupe was soon abandoned.

The situation at the San Saba missions, then recently established, was very unsettled. There Fathers Terreros, Santiesteban, and Molina were leading a precarious existence. The Apaches were afraid to locate at this place because of the increased hostility of their northern enemies. In March the Comanches and their allies appeared, two thousand or more, on horseback. On the 16th they attacked the mission killing Fathers Terreros and Santiesteban, and six other persons. The reason for the massacre was a general impression that the Spaniards had, by establishing the mission, allied themselves with the Apaches.

An effort was made to build up confidence and morale which had been greatly disturbed by these terrible atrocities. New missionaries were sent to carry on the work of evangelization off the natives. Fathers Francisco Aparicio and Pedro Parras were the appointments from the college of Santa Cruz. Fathers Junipero Serra and Francisco Palou were the choice of the college of San Fernando. At the last moment plans were changed and these two illustrious sons of St. Francis, instead of coming to Texas, became the great apostles of California.<sup>16</sup>

\* Quoted from Bolton, Herbert Eugene: *Texas in the Middle Eighteenth Century*, p. 268—For detailed account—op. cit. *The San Xavier Missions*, chap. viii and ix.

<sup>16</sup> Engelhardt, Fray Zephyrin: *The Missions and Missionaries in California*; *ibid.*: *Missionary Labors of the Franciscans Among the Indians in the Early Days, in the Franciscan Herald, monthly from 1914-1917, inclusive*; Bolton, Herbert Eugene: *Texas in the Middle Eighteenth Century*; *ibid.*: Many articles in the *Quarterly of the Texas State Hist. Assoc. on the Missions*. Dr. Bolton has done the most learned and scholarly work on Texas history. The many original documents uncovered by him are a revelation to other investigators and research students; *ibid.*: De Mezieres, *ibid.*: *Guide to the Materials for History of the U. S. in the Archives of Mexico*. Espinosa, Isidoro: *Cronica Seraphica*; Arricivita, Juan: *Cronica Seraphica*; Dunn, William Edward: *Articles on the Apache Rela-*

Nearly four centuries have passed since the first soldiers of the Cross began their spiritual conquest of the Southwest. For three-score years and more before the Pilgrim Fathers landed at Plymouth Rock on the New England shore, the Franciscan Fathers had labored, suffered, and died here for the cause of Christianity. Nay, they did even more, they gave their lives as a complete oblation and as a supreme test of their fidelity and devotion. Their crowns of martyrdom, richly jeweled with gems of ruby blood, entwined with richest garlands of virtue are the imperishable memorials that adorn the Cross of Christ, the King of Martyrs. Long may He reign in this land of predilection, rendered sacred by the blood of the saintly padres and the manifestation of their many miracles.

PAUL J. FOIK, C.S.C., Ph.D.

*St. Edward's University, Austin, Texas.*

---

*tions in Texas in Texas State Hist. Assoc. Quarterly*, xiv, pp. 198-274; xv, 186-200, xvi, 379-414; Shea, John Gilmary: *The Catholic Church in Colonial Days*; Wooten, Dudley: *Comprehensive History of Texas*, 1685-1897. For the San Antonio missions the *Bezar Archives* of the University of Texas are abundant in source materials as also the *State Archives* and those of San Fernando Cathedral in San Antonio. See Bolton's bibliography of documentary materials in his *Texas in the Middle of the Eighteenth Century*.

## THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF CATHOLIC SOCIETIES

(Continued)

*Third National Convention held in Atlantic City, N. J., Aug. 1-5, 1903*

RT. REV. JAMES A. McFAUL, D. D., of Trenton, N. J., Sponsor

The Third Annual Convention of the American Federation of Catholic Societies was held at Atlantic City, N. J., from August 1 to 5, 1903. The opening services were conducted at St. Nicholas Church with the following prelates in attendance: Rt. Rev. J. A. McFaul, D.D., Bishop of Trenton, N. J.; Rt. Rev. S. G. Messmer, D.D., Bishop of Green Bay, Wis.; Rt. Rev. B. J. Keiley, D.D., Bishop of Savannah, Ga. The celebrant of the High Mass (Coram Episcopo) was Rev. F. J. McShane, O.S.A., of Atlantic City, N. J. Bishop Messmer preached the sermon, taking his text from St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (Chap. XII). The Bishop spoke of the duties of the Catholic laity, especially of bringing Catholic truth before non-Catholics.

The convention sessions were presided over by President F. B. Minahan. There were delegates present from 38 states, the District of Columbia and Porto Rico. Sixteen delegates were present from the State of Illinois. The report of the National Secretary disclosed great progress in organization work, and letters of endorsement were read from President Roosevelt, Archbishop D. Falconio, Apostolic Delegate to the U. S. A., and many Bishops. The affiliation of the Chippewa and Sioux Indians was also reported and that Chief Tall Mandan of South Dakota was a delegate to the convention.

Bishop B. J. Keiley of Savannah, Ga., when called upon for a few remarks, stated that he is a convert to the idea of Catholic Federation and that converts excel in fervor those who from infancy have been brought up in the Church. He said that he at first feared that partisan politics might creep into Federation, but that fear had now entirely disappeared.

The Bishop was followed by Mr. F. B. Minahan, who explained the almost insurmountable difficulty experienced in launching the Federation movement, but the ringing commands of its two episcopal leaders, Bishop McFaul and Bishop Messmer, "Don't give up the ship," gave courage to the officers; and at this convention the two

great nationalities in this country, the German and the Irish, have removed all mistrust which was so noticeable at the Cincinnati and Chicago conventions. President Minahan then paid a beautiful tribute to Pope Leo XIII, whose death had been announced.

The second session opened with Pontifical Mass celebrated by Bishop B. J. Keiley. In the Sanctuary were Archbishop Ryan of Philadelphia and Bishops McFaul and Messmer. A powerful sermon was preached by Rev. W. P. Cantwell of Long Branch, N. J. He spoke of "Unity" and quoted extensively from the Encyclical of Leo XIII on "Christian Democracy," saying "that the Holy Father in his encyclical advises the Catholic societies of every land to unite and to stand together in defense of Christian principles."

On the evening of the second day Rev. William O'Brien Pardow, S. J., of New York, gave a stirring address on "Christian Education."

The third day opened with a Pontifical Requiem for Pope Leo XIII, with Bishop Messmer as celebrant. Rt. Rev. Monsignor John H. Fox, vicar general of the Diocese of Trenton, N. J., gave a wonderful sermon on the "Supremacy of Peter," concluding with a prayer that "our Divine Lord will fill the chair of Peter with a wise, great and good successor to Leo XIII."

At the business session a great deal of routine business was transacted, such as reports of standing committees, reports of State and County Federations, etc., and impromptu addresses on timely subjects were delivered by Judge M. F. Girtan of Chicago on the "Benefits of Organization," by Mr. Joaquin Ferran of Porto Rico on "Conditions in Porto Rico," supplementing his remarks with a letter from Rt. Rev. James H. Blenk, Bishop of Porto Rico (later Archbishop of New Orleans, La.); by Chief Peter Tall Mandan ("Miwatani Haska"), the Indian delegate from South Dakota, and by Rev. Father Digmann, S. J., an Indian Missionary.

In the evening of the third day a mass meeting was held in St. Nicholas Church, presided over by Bishop McFaul. The principal speaker was Hon Ed. J. McDermott of Louisville, Ky. (later Lieutenant Governor of Kentucky), whose address was an eulogy of "Pope Leo XIII and the Papacy." The address was a masterly one which covered a wide range and was fortified by many quotations from standard Protestant writers such as Macaulay, Bryce, Hallam, Guizot, Canon Farrar and Lecky.

The fourth day session opened with the reading of a cablegram from Rome announcing the election of Cardinal Sarto, Patriarch of Venice, as the successor to Leo XIII, who had assumed the name of

Pius X. Great applause followed this announcement and a cablegram of greeting to the new Pontiff was immediately forwarded.

The various committees now made their reports. The Resolutions adopted covered the Federation's views on "Christian Education," "Marriage," "The Philippine Question," "France," "Indian Schools," "Catholic Truth Society," "Offensive and Erroneous Books in Public Libraries," "The Press," "Lynching," "Temporal Power of the Pope," "Socialism and the Labor Question."

A great debate arose over the Resolution on the Philippines between Rev. John J. Wynne, S. J., of New York, and Rev. James T. O'Reiley, O. S. A., of Lawrence, Mass. The controversy was over the preamble of the Resolution referring to "the lamentable condition of religious affairs in the Philippines being due to the policy *adopted* by United States officials." Father Wynne suggested the substitution of the word "*tolerated*" for *adopted*, which was finally assented to by Father O'Reiley. The debate brought prominently before the delegates the conditions in the Philippines, which led Dr. Conde B. Pallen to exclaim, in his address which followed: "Thank God for this debate; you have held the metal in the fire until it became glowing hot; you have hammered it upon the anvil until you had it in shape, and then you steeped it in the bath of the waters of prudence."

On the fourth day there was another mass meeting, presided over by Bishop McFaul. Addresses were delivered by the Hon. Walter George Smith of Philadelphia on "The True Ideal of Catholic Federation"; by Rev. H. C. Ganss, D. D., on "The Church and the Indian." (This address was gotten out in booklet form by "The Messenger of the Sacred Heart," New York, price 5 cents). Dr. Ganss paid a beautiful tribute to Mother Katherine Drexel who has been one of the main supporters of the Indian Schools. Dr. Ganss stated that the total amount collected throughout the U. S. in 1902 for the Indian Schools was \$22,090 and that Mother Drexel gave in that year alone \$83,000.

The fifth day marked the closing session, with addresses by Mr. Nicholas Gonner of Dubuque, Iowa, of the German Central Verein, who spoke on "Catholic Federation for All Societies," and Mr. F. W. Immekus of Pittsburgh, on "German State League of Pennsylvania." After the usual resolutions of thanks, the officers for 1903-1904 were elected as follows: National President, T. B. Minahan, Columbus, O.; First Vice President, J. B. Oelkers, Newark, N. J.; Second Vice President, F. J. Kierce, San Francisco, Cal.; Third Vice President, Edward Feeney, Brooklyn, N. Y.; National Secretary, Anthony Matré, Cincinnati, O.; National Treasurer, H. J. Fries, Erie,



Pa.; Executive Board: N. Gonner, Dubuque, Iowa; Thomas H. Cannon, Chicago, Ill.; F. W. Immekus, Pittsburgh, Pa.; J. W. Fowler, Louisville, Ky.; Walter G. Smith, Philadelphia, Pa.; J. Galvin, Brattleboro, Vt.; Peter Wallrath, Evansville, Ind. At this convention Mr. C. E. Royer of Erie, Pa., submitted a design for an Emblem of Federation which was adopted.

This convention adjourned to meet in Detroit, Mich., in 1904.

• • • •

*Fourth National Convention Held in Detroit, Mich., Aug. 2-3-4, 1904*

RT. REV. JOHN S. FOLEY, D.D., of Detroit, Mich., Sponsor

The Fourth National Convention of the American Federation of Catholic Societies took place at Detroit, Mich., August 2, 3, 4, 1904. The opening services were held in St. Mary's Church with Rt. Rev. John S. Foley, D.D., Bishop of Detroit, as celebrant of the Pontifical Mass. Among the prelates in attendance were Archbishop W. H. Elder of Cincinnati, O.; Archbishop S. G. Messmer of Milwaukee, Wis.; Bishops Maes of Covington, Stang of Fall River, Mass., and McFaul of Trenton, N. J. The Uniformed Knights of St. John, under command of Col. Caspar H. Schulte, took prominent part and escorted the delegates from the Cadillac Hotel to the church. The sermon preached on this occasion was by Rev. P. O'Brien of Toledo, O., who took for his subject: "Render, therefore, unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." He concluded his masterly address by saying: "Discuss the questions that may come before you honestly and fearlessly, as becomes true American citizens. Hew to the line, no matter where the chips may fall. Let religion and patriotism guide all your actions, and may God bless your deliberations."

The business sessions were held in the Armory of the Detroit Light Guards. The delegates were welcomed to Detroit by Colonel C. H. Schulte, President of the Detroit Federation; by Hon. Mayor W. C. Maybury and by Bishop J. S. Foley. Responses were made by National President F. B. Minahan, Bishop McFaul and by Archbishop Messmer. Bishop C. P. Maes of Covington, Ky., also gave a brief address and Archbishop Elder of Cincinnati, gave the benediction. Roll call showed 24 states, 8 dioceses, 10 national organizations and 5 state leagues represented. Letters from 30 Archbishops and Bishops were read.

A report on Federation activities during the past year disclosed that the resolutions adopted by the Atlantic City convention met with the cordial approbation of distinguished churchmen. Cardinal Richard of Paris thanked Federation on the expression of sympathy extended to the Catholics of France, now being tried by persecution. Bishop Grant of the Methodist Church gave Federation's resolution on "Christian Education" unqualified endorsement as did also the Catholic Educational Conference held in St. Louis, Mo. The Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions, through Rev. William N. Ketcham, sent a letter of gratitude for the assistance Federation rendered in the matter of the restoration of the rations to our Catholic Indians. It was announced that the work of Federation is becoming more and more recognized and its literature was requested by prominent churchmen and laymen of Germany, Ireland and Canada.

#### THE FATHER MARQUETTE STATUE

The National Secretary informed the convention that at the National Executive Board meeting he was directed to send the following resolution to all Congressmen and Senators of the U. S. A.:

*Whereas*, the statue of Father James Marquette, the gift of the State of Wisconsin to the Nation's Hall of Fame, has not yet been formally accepted by the Congress of the U. S., and

*Whereas*, this statue has been for a number of years in place in the National Capitol, although its acceptance by the House of Representatives has been denied; and

*Whereas*, the acceptance of this statue is desired by all patriotic citizens, to the end that the glorious memory of the great explorer and discoverer of the Mississippi shall be perpetuated by the nation; therefore, be it

*Resolved*, by the Executive Board of the American Federation of Catholic Societies that we respectfully urge upon the present Congress, the formal and early acceptance of the statue of Father Marquette, the gift of the State of Wisconsin to the Nation's Hall of Fame.

It is needless to state, says the National Secretary in his annual report, that Congress finally accepted the Father Marquette statue and that a letter was sent by Federation to Wm. T. Otjen, conveying to him the thanks of the Federation, as follows:

Cincinnati, O., February 4, 1904.

Hon. T. Otjen, Washington, D. C.

Hon. and dear Sir:—The Executive Board of the American Federation of Catholic Societies, speaking for one million members of the Federation, in fact, expressing the sentiments of all American

Catholics, greatly appreciate the part your Honor has taken in introducing into the House of Congress the bill for the acceptance of the Pere Marquette statue, and hereby tender you the thanks of the Federation.

Respectfully yours,

F. B. MINAHAN, National President.

ANTHONY MATRE, National Secretary.

In his report, National President Minahan stated that a Federation was launched in New York at a meeting held in Carnegie Hall over which Archbishop Farley presided and at which Hon. Bourke Cochran and Wm. Koelble spoke.

At Tuesday evening's mass meeting the Indian chief, Charging Bear, spoke in the Indian language and was interpreted by Rev. Father Strassmaier, O.S.B., of North Dakota, who also spoke. Addresses were also delivered by Dr. Condé B. Pallen of New York, on "Christian Education" and by Bishop McFaul on "Catholic Federation—Its Aim."

The second day of the convention opened with Pontifical Requiem at Sts. Peter and Paul's Church. Bishop C. P. Maes of Covington, Kk., was celebrant, assisted by Very Rev. Jos. Schrembs, Vicar General of Grand Rapids, Mich., and Rev. J. Otten. Archbishop Elder and Bishop McFaul occupied seats in the sanctuary.

The business session followed. The first on the program was an informal address by Bishop Hennessy of Wichita, Kansas, on Church Extension and other matters.

The Bishop said in part:

You are gathered here from all quarters of this country. Would not the American Federation of Catholic Societies do a good work if it could form a Board of Church Extension, as the different churches of the Protestant denomination have? How that is to be formed I do not know; I have not given it sufficient study to be able to give you any information on it. I know that if we had among ourselves a Board from which money could be borrowed, at a low rate of interest, on church property, or church property exclusively in the West, or anywhere else where it was needed, that it would be doing a progressive work—a work, I believe, in keeping with the object of Federation. Your object is, I believe, a bettering of our condition. I don't know of any better object than to take care of our fellow citizens who go into the West, buying their little farms, and with very little more money, than to supply them with places where they can adore Almighty God, and practice the truths of their religion. In time this money comes back. Certainly no Board of Church Extension will be at any loss for any contribution they make to the great plains of the West. . . .

About a year ago I was called upon by a committee to give permission to purchase, in a little town in Western Kansas, a Protestant church, to be used for Catholic services—a small congregation—and this committee made request. There was no church; the congregation was small; the people had just moved in there, and the Protestant church could be had at a low figure. Certainly I gave permission. When the deed came to me I found that the owner of that church was an organization in the City of New York, called a Church Extension Society. On inquiry, I found that some years before a small congregation of—I think they were Congregational people—attempted to build a church in this little town, and they borrowed from their organization in New York, the Church Extension Society, the sum of \$700 or \$800. The congregation dwindled down, the Catholics moved in, and bought the church for \$400. . . .

I am now asking the Federation to incorporate in its work as a society of Catholic people a Board to assist weak Western parishes in putting houses over their heads and schools for their children; to loan them money at a low rate of interest, to be paid back, and a mortgage to be given on the property. There you have a work which is the propagation of the Faith in fruit. I leave the matter of a Church Extension Board for the consideration of your officers and your Resolutions Committee.

[At the meeting of the Executive Board, held in Cincinnati, Ohio, September 12, 1905, with Archbishop Messmer, Bishop McFaul, Messrs. Peter Wallrath of Evansville, Ind.; F. W. Immekus of Pittsburgh, Pa.; C. H. Schulte of Detroit, Mich.; Nicholas Gonner of Dubuque, Ia.; A. Dunlap of Cincinnati (proxy for Walter George Smith of Philadelphia); Alphonse G. Koelble of New York, and Anthony Matre, in attendance, the matter of Church Extension, on the lines proposed at the Detroit convention, was thoroughly discussed and endorsed by the Executive Board with the recommendation to have a committee appointed at the next convention to be held at Buffalo, N. Y., to take up this work. The plan outlined by the Executive Board was to assist in the establishment of churches in various parts of the country; to advance money to struggling parishes and help them until they become self-sustaining. National officers of Fraternal Societies, who invest their organizations' funds in mortgages and bonds, were to be placed on this committee on Church Extension. An interesting address made by Rev. F. C. Kelley, now Bishop Kelley of Oklahoma, on the Catholic Church Extension Society, of which he is the founder, and which he delivered at the Buffalo Federation convention will appear in a future article.]

The Rt. Rev. J. J. Hartley, Bishop of Columbus, O., was called upon and in his address he stated among other things:

In this country of fifteen million Catholic people, our voice is like the voice of St. John the Baptist, as one crying in the wilderness—in the wilderness of commercialism, Socialism, selfishness and carelessness, indifferent to everything that goes on, we leave the church to feel its way and do the best it can. What is the reason we are not doing some good for Catholic union in this country? I say it is in the first place, because our forces are scattered, our minds are pre-occupied with selfish ends . . . We ought to unite our forces, not be scattered lots, but stand shoulder to shoulder, and this Federation seems to be a society that has that object in view. . . .

It will be a blessed day for the Catholic people of the United States when we lift ourselves outside of partisan lines and stand in the middle of the road, to fight the cause of God, Church and our country—independent of all partisan politics. And, gentlemen, if I were to point out the places where these battles are to be fought I will say to you that the *Church*, the *School*, the *Home* and the *United States*, these are the battlefields—the interests of these four are dear to every Catholic heart. I will do all I can in my own little diocese to promote the cause of Catholic Federation. . . .

Very Rev. Joseph Schrembs, Vicar General of Grand Rapids, Mich. (now Bishop of Cleveland, O., and chairman of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Lay Organizations), addressed the meeting as follows:

The Federation is reaching out; it is going deeper; it is going to the very fountain-head, to the very source of all that is Catholic—back to the family, into the very heart of the family. The unit of Christian life is the family; the next unit is the parish, for it is there that the families are congregated; and now the Federation is striving to reach the real Federation—the Federation of Catholic parishes by which it reaches out its hand into every Catholic family in the land; and, oh, how grand an object, and how grand a blessing, the day when every Catholic family of the land shall be gathered together, when they shall stand hand to hand, like one man, before the country, and when the Church can stand behind in the person of her pastors and say: "Behold them; these are my children!"

Other addresses were made by Hon. M. F. Girtan of Chicago, who spoke of the persecution of the Church in France and referred to the sacrileges committed in that country on the last Good Friday when the crucifixes were torn from the walls of public buildings. He urged the sending of a strong resolution to those responsible for the persecution—condemning their actions—and of voicing sentiments of sympathy and prayer to the persecuted.

Father W. McMahon of Cleveland, O., spoke briefly on the need of a Catholic Publishing House in the U. S.



Father Michaelis of Toledo, O., pointed out the dangers of Socialism, stating that a declaration of the Federation opposing Socialism will be beneficial in our fight. "Socialism," said the speaker, "is a living issue and the arguments advanced by its agitators, and which appeal to the people, is the bread-and-butter argument. Federation should show that its sympathies are with the plain people."

At the evening's mass meeting at the Armory, Mr. Thomas McKenna of New York presided. The principal address was delivered by Rev. Thomas J. Campbell, S. J., of New York, on "Socialism"—one of the burning questions at that time. He was followed by an address on "Federation" by Mr. Thomas B. Minahan, and by Mr. Nicholas Gonner of Dubuque, who spoke on "Catholic Leaders."

At the closing session August 4th, over which Mr. Thomas H. Cannon of Chicago, Ill., presided, the committee on Resolutions, through its chairman, Mr. Walter George Smith of Philadelphia, made its report. The Resolutions—or Federation platform—expressed Federation's views on: Loyalty to Pope Pius X; The Temporal Power of the Pope; Support of the Church; Praise for the German Centre Party; Persecution of Religious Orders in France; Catholic Indian Schools; Education of the Negro; Guarding the Faith of Catholic Immigrants; Religion in the Schools; Sunday Observance; The Church in the Philippines Support of the Catholic University; Reform of Divorce Laws; Socialism Condemned; Bribery and Corruption Deplored; Catholic Books in Public Libraries; Jubilee of the Immaculate Conception.

After the reading of the Resolutions, a debate ensued in which Rev. J. H. Muehlenbeck of Toledo, O.; Rev. John J. Wynne, S. J., New York, and Mr. Walter George Smith took part. The debate was most enlightening and the convention was grateful to Father Muehlenbeck for precipitating the same.

The financial report of the National Treasurer disclosed that the amount received by him during the past year was \$3,033.56. The expenditures were \$2,558.25—leaving a balance in treasury of \$475.31.

After the report of the Committee of Ways and Means, of which Mr. Joseph Berning of Cincinnati was chairman, the usual Resolutions of Thanks were offered. The Nomination Committee then made its report as follows:

## THE OFFICERS

For President—Thomas B. Minahan of New York.  
For First Vice President—John B. Oelkers of New Jersey.  
For Second Vice President—Edward Feeney of New York.  
For Third Vice President—George W. Stenger of Minnesota.  
For Secretary—Anthony Matré of Ohio.  
For Treasurer—C. H. Schulte of Michigan.  
For Marshal—N. W. Merwick of Kansas.  
For Color Bearer—Chief Tall Mandan of South Dakota.

## EXECUTIVE BOARD

Walter George Smith of Pennsylvania.  
Nicholas Gonner of Iowa.  
Thomas H. Cannon of Illinois.  
J. W. Fowler of Kentucky.  
F. W. Immekus of Pennsylvania.  
Peter Wallrath of Indian.  
H. N. Coulon of Louisiana.

The above officers were unanimously elected, and Bishop McFaul performed the installation ceremony. The convention was adjourned with prayer by Archbishop Messmer and the singing of "The Star-Spangled Banner."

ANTHONY MATRE, K.S.G., National Secretary.

*Chicago, Ill.*

## ILLINOIS: THE CRADLE OF CHRISTIANITY AND CIVILIZATION IN MID-AMERICA

(Continued from April, 1928)

### CHAPTER VI.

#### FORT ST. LOUIS

After one of the most trying journeys ever made over American swamps and prairies, and through unknown forests, Tonti arrived again at Fort St. Louis (Starved Rock) in September, 1690.

His status was now uncertain, and he promptly took steps to communicate with his government, suggesting a course which would be agreeable to him. This communication took the form of a petition addressed to the Count de Pontchartrain. The petition itself bears no date, but there is a general agreement among writers that it was written in 1690. The original was found in the archives of the Marine Department of Paris, and was translated by the historian, Jared Sparks. Like everything that Tonti wrote, it is very concise, and in a few paragraphs gives the main incidents in this great explorer's life. The petition reads as follows:

Henry de Tonti humbly represents to your highness that he entered the military service as a cadet, and was employed in that capacity in the years 1668 and 1669; and that he afterwards served as a midshipman four years, at Marseilles and Toulon, and made seven campaigns, that is, four on board ships of war and three in the galleys. While at Messina he was made a captain, and in the interval lieutenant of the first company of a regiment of horse. When the enemy attacked the post of Libisso his right hand was shot away by a grenade, and he was taken prisoner and conducted to Metasse, where he was detained six months and then exchanged for the son of the governor of that place. He then went to France to obtain some favor from his majesty, and the king granted him three hundred livres. He returned to the service in Sicily, made the campaign as a volunteer in the galleys, and when the troops were discharged, being unable to obtain employment he solicited at court, on account of the general peace, he decided in 1678 to join the late Monsieur de La Salle, in order to accompany him in the discoveries of Mexico, during which until 1682, he was the only officer who did not abandon him.

These discoveries being finished, he remained in 1683, commandant of Fort St. Louis of the Illinois; and, in 1684, he was there at-

tacked by two hundred Iroquois, whom he repulsed with great loss on their side. During the same year he repaired to Quebec under the orders of M. de la Barre. In 1685 he returned to the Illinois, according to the orders which he received from the court, and from M. de La Salle, as a captain of foot in a marine detachment, and governor, of Fort St. Louis. In 1686 he went with forty men in canoes at his own expense, as far as the Gulf of Mexico to seek for M. de La Salle. Not being able to find him there, he returned to Montreal and put himself under the orders of Monsieur Denonville, to engage in the war with the Iroquois. At the head of a band of Indians, in 1687, he proceeded two hundred leagues by land, and as far in canoes, and joined the army, when, with these Indians and a company of Canadians, he forced the ambuscade of the Tsonnonthouans.

The campaign over, he returned to the Illinois, whence he departed in 1689, to go in search of the remains of M. de La Salle's colony; but, being deserted by his men, and unable to execute his design, he was compelled to relinquish it, when he had arrived within seven days' march of the Spaniards. Ten months were spent in going and returning. As he now finds himself without employment, he prays that, in consideration of his voyages and heavy expenses, and considering also that during his service of seven years as captain he has not received any pay, your highness will be pleased to obtain from his majesty a company, with which he may continue his service in this country, where he has not ceased to harass the Iroquois by enlisting the Illinois against them in his majesty's cause.

And he will continue his prayers for the health of your highness.

HENRY DE TONTI.<sup>1</sup>

The Count de Frontenac was still living and strongly indorsed the petition as follows:

Nothing can be more true than the account given by the Sieur de Tonti in this petition; and should his majesty reinstate the seven companies which have been disbanded into this country, there will be justice in granting one of them to him, or some other recompense for the services which he has rendered, and which he is now returning to render, at Fort St. Louis of the Illinois.

FRONTENAC.<sup>2</sup>

De La Forest also petitioned the King for joint ownership of Fort St. Louis. His petition follows:

#### THE SIRE DE LA FOREST

ASKS FOR THE PROPERTY OF THE FORT OF ST. LOUIS IN COMMON  
WITH HENRY DE TONTI

The Sire de La Forest represents that he has been obliged to go to France to explain the conditions at the Fort of St. Louis and that

<sup>1</sup> Legler—*The Man With the Iron Hand*, p. 43.

<sup>2</sup> Ibidem.

of the Illinois, where the Sire de Tonti and he had been abandoned without help of any kind since the departure of the Sire de La Salle, and where, in spite of that, he had kept all the people in that vicinity obedient to the King, so that he was able to send two hundred men to M. de Denonville to war against the Iriquois; all this at the expense of M. de La Forest, for he has paid all the expenses of the expeditions which he commanded.

The said Sire de La Forest further represents that he was sent to Canada in 1684, as captain to a troupe of Marines; that he received his pay for the year 1684 only, and that the pay for the succeeding five years are due him; that, since the Sire La Salle received the order to construct the Fort of St. Louis in the country of the Illinois, he had been proposed as Commandant, and that the Sire de Tonti and himself had between them kept all the expenses up, kept the Fort in good order, defended and enlarged it, continued and augmented commercial relations, and that the parties of Frenchmen and Illinois that he sent to wage war upon the Iroquois killed ninety-six of them and sent their scalps to the Fort of St. Louis.

The Sire de La Forest begs, if it pleases the King, that he be paid the money which is owing to him.

He offers to continue at the said Fort St. Louis the same functions, together with the said Sire de Tonti, if it pleases his Majesty to afford him the same privileges as to the Sire de La Salle, deceased, this post being one of great importance in Canada, and offers also to guarantee to keep all the neighboring people obedient to the King and friendly to each other. If His Majesty agrees to this proposition, and accepts his services, he further agrees to use all the fortune of which he is possessed and all the credit which he may have and all of the influence of his friends and relatives, to keep up the Fort in the best possible shape and to sustain the commerce. And, as His Majesty has not been informed of the particulars of the voyage of the Sire La Salle, nor of the fate of the Frenchmen who were with him, he offers to go to the place where they were last heard of in order to find out all possible details and to give an exact account thereafter of the conditions as discovered, if His Majesty will be pleased to give him the necessary funds to finance the voyage.

The young lady, Miss Tonti, in a letter begs His Majesty to read with attention the papers presented to him touching on affairs in the country of the Illinois, so that, in consideration of the services rendered him by the Sire Henry Tonti, one of her brothers, and the Sire de La Forest, for so many years, His Majesty will order that their pay may be given them so that they may pay their debts and be able to sustain their posts and continue commercial relations in the country.

The Marquis de Denonville made a certificate that the Sires Tonti and de La Forest, captains in the Marine Corps, served, under the orders of M. de La Barre and his own, always paying their own expenses, and that they received only their first year's pay, in 1684, and that in 1687 they came to join him at the Fort of Frontenac, at



the head of a number of Frenchmen and savages which they had brought from the country of the Illinois, about five hundred leagues from there, which they could not so do without spending a large sum of money; that, after having chosen them the next year to command when the Sonnantouans attacked the Fort, they made a show of great valor, intelligence and honesty upon that and every other occasion which came up, without having ever received any money in payment of the large sums which they were obliged to spend.

The Sire de Denonville, says in his certificate that it would be very difficult to find anyone to go in search of those whom the Sire La Salle left on the coasts of Mexico.

The petitions were granted on orders as follows:

### GIFT OF GROUND

OF THE FORT OF ST. LOUIS OF THE ILLINOIS, TO SIRE DE TONTI AND  
DE LA FOREST UNDER THE SAME CONDITIONS AS WHEN  
GIVEN TO SIRE DE LA SALLE

Versailles, July 14, 1690.

The King, sitting with his council, issued letters the 20th of May, 1676, giving power to the Governor and Lieut. Governor and to the Commissioner of Justice, Police and Finance, of said county to give concessions of ground as well to the newcomers as to the old inhabitants of the country if they will register the land that same year and they are obliged to plow and till the ground for six years from the date of registration under pain of annulment; these letters were registered at the Sovereign Council of Canada, October 19, 1676, stating the concessions given by the Sire de Denonville, Governor and Lieutenant Governor and by the Sire de Champigny, Commissioner of Justice, Police and Finance in said country from the 15th of November, 1688, until the 15th of October, 1689, of many hills, valleys, islands and rivers. \* \* \* \* \*

There was also a request presented to His Majesty by the Sires de La Forest and Tonti asking if it would please His Majesty to accord them the establishment made at the Fort St. Louis by the Sire La Salle which they have kept up since his death at great expense and care and His Majesty wishing to confirm the said concessions so that they might enjoy them peacefully and forever, assures possession to the said de La Forest and Tonti of the establishment made by Sire La Salle and orders them to continue to work with even greater application and to maintain and enlarge the establishment.

His Majesty, sitting with His Council, confirmed the concessions made to the Sires. \* \* \* \* \*

His Majesty also orders the said Sires de La Forest and Tonti to take possession of the Fort of St. Louis at Illinois and of the land given to the Sire La Salle under the same terms and conditions as those in the concession made to him and letters of confirmation and all other necessary letters will be sent to them. His Majesty wishes

that this document together with the said concessions be registered at the Sovereign Council at Quebec so that it can be consulted if necessary.

Passed by the Council of State of the King, His Majesty being present, held at Versailles, the 14th day of July, 1690.<sup>3</sup>

Conjointly therefore with La Forest, Tonti was granted the proprietorship of Fort St. Louis, carrying with it the right to trade in the country, and he remained at the old Fort while La Forest took up his station at Chicago.

The policy of federation and pacification of the Indian tribes was continued, and it seems fair to state that on the plains of Illinois surrounding the Fort on the Rock was gathered the first and only successful federation of Indian tribes that ever existed on the American Continent. Other leagues had been before that time and were afterwards formed, but all others had for their object war or aggression. Tonti's was the first league of nations for peace.

It is truly regrettable that the record of the ten years of Tonti's reign succeeding the death of La Salle are so scant and unsatisfactory. Virtually all that is known of the events of these years, is what can be found in the letters and reports of the missionaries who labored in the vicinity. Father Claude Jean Allouez, S. J., came to the territory in the days of La Salle, and he was succeeded by Father James Gravier, S. J., and before the end of Tonti's reign, Fathers Pinet, Bineteau and Marest, all Jesuits, had come to the locality. The Fathers of the Foreign Missions from Canada, Cosme, Montigny and Davion also reached the territory in Tonti's time.

None of the missionaries tell us much of the conditions of government or settlement at the fort, but they are unanimous in praise of Tonti. It is to be remembered that both Allouez and Cravier came to the country in company with Tonti and enjoyed his protection, and the Fathers of the Foreign Missions were met and escorted through the State by him.

Much has been written to the effect that there was enmity between La Salle and the Jesuits. Writers insist that the Jesuits thwarted La Salle's plans, and conjecture that the Jesuits feared La Salle and were opposed to his policies. In this connection it has been pointed out that Father Allouez left Fort St. Louis when he heard that La Salle was coming there, and writers argue that this incident and some others which have been brought forward are evidence of fear or hatred on the part of the Jesuits. In the same connection it is frequently stated that the Jesuits were jealous of the Recollects, and

<sup>3</sup> Margery, p. 51.

later of the Fathers of the Foreign Missions and Capuchins, but the records do not disclose any unreasonable conduct on the part of the Jesuits. They were the first in the field, and made supreme sacrifices to open up the territory, and naturally felt that they were entitled to some consideration on that account. They never permitted their feelings in this regard to carry them beyond action or dignified protest, however. On the other hand, the letters and reports of contemporaries are replete with incidents of the highest courtesy extended by the Jesuits to representatives of the other orders.

Nor is there anything in available data to warrant the conclusion some writers have drawn as to the Jesuits opposing La Salle's projects. The manner in which Tonti, La Salle's lieutenant during the lifetime of the latter, always received and aided the Jesuits, and the extreme cordiality that existed between them would indicate that there was not the mutual aversion between La Salle and the Jesuits that we are told existed, else his representative would not go to such extremes to serve the Jesuits.

There was really, however, a cause of contention between the Jesuits and all the traders in which class La Salle and his people must be cataloged. These traders were seeking their own aggrandizement. The principal project of the expeditions undertaken was commerce with the Indians, and the traders were far from scrupulous in their dealings. But more than that—they carried on a liquor traffic with the Indians that was very obnoxious to the Jesuit Missionaries and tended to neutralize all their missionary endeavors.

From the very earliest days of the dealings with the Indians in this country, the Jesuits set their faces against the pernicious practice of the traders in furnishing the Indians with liquor, and their persistent opposition was the cause of constantly recurring clashes between the tradespeople and the missionaries. Not sufficient credit has been given the missionaries for the war they always waged against the liquor traffic, which was in reality the ruin of the Indian tribes. It should perhaps be stated that not all of the exploiters of Indian trade were subject to criticism with respect to the liquor traffic, and it is pleasant to recall that Joliet, Father Marquette's companion in the first voyage of discovery, was a stern opponent of the practice. By royal command a council was held in Quebec in 1678 to consider the subject of the traffic in brandy with the Indians. The assembly was composed of the principal officers and ten of the oldest and most prominent inhabitants of the colony, amongst whom was Joliet. Their advice was asked in turn and some favored the traffic, but Joliet

strongly denounced it and held that in the woods and among the savages it should be prohibited under pain of death.<sup>4</sup>

It never was effectively prohibited, however, and the Jesuit war against the liquor traffic with the Indians fills many chapters of the true history of New France, and to this and other objections to trade relations, may be ascribed the differences, such as existed, between the Jesuits and La Salle.

It would be interesting to recite the intimate story of the Fort St. Louis settlement. Some writers have drawn upon their imagination in picturing the life on the summit of the Big Rock, and stray references have enabled us to identify some of the French residents of the district, amongst whom we find names that later became prominent or familiar in the history of Illinois. There is excellent reason for believing that many of the French, and indeed, many of the Indians, prospered, and that amongst the savages civilization was very greatly advanced.

For this period we have a letter from Father Gravier, the Vicar-General himself, written from his missionary site at Peoria. This letter is dated February 15th, 1694.

In the discharge of his duties as Missionary and Vicar-General, he had spent the previous winter amongst the Miami, but when he returned to the Kaskaskia village, he found that the Kaskaskia Indians had moved down to the neighborhood of Peoria Lake. He accordingly had to make special accommodations for them and built a new chapel outside of the fort. This chapel he blessed during the month of April, and probably for the first time on Illinois soil, a special demonstration was made for the completion and dedication of a church. Father Gravier says that:

On the eve before blessing the chapel and Cross, which is nearly thirty-five feet high, I invited the French to be good enough to be present. They promised to be there and to manifest in public the honor in which they held it. They showed the Savages by four volleys from their guns their veneration for this symbol of their salvation.<sup>5</sup>

Father Gravier tells us, too, of what was perhaps the first trade conference concerning Illinois' interests.

About the middle of May, says he, the deputies of the Savages of this village accompanied by two Frenchmen went to seek the alliance of the Missouri and of the Osages. These French merchants

<sup>4</sup> Mason, *Chapters from Illinois History*, p. 37.

<sup>5</sup> Thwaites—*Jesuit Relations*, LXIV, p. 161.

with the view of carrying on an advantageous trade with those tribes, made some proposals of peace to them. To these they agreed solely out of complaisance to the French, through consideration for whom they became reconciled with the Osages.<sup>6</sup>

• • • •

About the 20th of June, the French and the Savages who had left here during the previous month to seek the alliance of the *Osages* and *Missouris*, in the expectation of the great profits that they would derive from the trade with the latter, came back with two chiefs from each village, accompanied by some elders and some women. Although these merchants in all the dealings of any extent that they have with Savages, care very little about telling them of God and of the missionary, the visitors all came, nevertheless, to see me, and I welcomed them as heartily as I could. I took them to the chapel and talked to them as if they understood me well; they were present at Mass and behaved with great modesty, following the example of the *Illinois*—whom they heard me instruct on several occasions, and cause to offer prayers to God. They manifested great joy when I led them to hope that I would go to see them, to give them sense—such is the expression that they use. But, as I am alone, I cannot assist or visit the other villages of the *Illinois*, which are on the banks of the Mississippi river. The *Osages* and the *Missouri* do not appear to be a quick-witted as the *Illinois*; their language does not seem very difficult. The former do not open their lips, and the latter speak still more from the throat than they.<sup>7</sup>

Father Gravier relates at length the troubles which he endured on account of the Manitous or Medicine Men and the effect these troubles had on his mission.

There was summer complaint in those days, too. Father Gravier says:

Disease broke out in this village in the month of August,—that is, after they began to eat new corn, squashes, watermelons and other half ripe fruit. Many children and young people were sick, and I had not as free access to all of them as I would have wished.

A determined attempt was made by some of the inhabitants to exterminate the mission and drive Father Gravier away, but by dint of his courage and address and the help of the chief's daughter especially, the sturdy old missionary won for the time.

The principal part of this very long letter is devoted to a relation of the conversion, sacrificial marriage and virtues of the daughter of the Chief, Amipintehicou. Michael Accau, who, it will be remembered, accompanied Father Louis Hennepin from Peoria down the

<sup>6</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>7</sup> Ibidem, 169-71.



Illinois River to the Mississippi, and up the Mississippi to St. Anthony's Falls, returned to Peoria and became enamored of the chief's daughter, a beautiful Indian maiden only seventeen years old. She seriously objected to marriage, as she had been converted to the Faith and proposed to dedicate her life to the service of religion. Her parents desiring her to marry a Frenchman for the benefit supposed to accrue from an alliance with the French, insisted persistently upon her marriage. She confided in Father Gravier, and the stout old missionary sustained her in her position. At the end, after much prayer, she concluded that she might be able to render a greater service to the Church by marrying Aceau and thus pleasing her parents and her people, and possibly through her influence reforming Aceau and helping to spread the Faith amongst the Indian villagers. Father Gravier approved her course, and so the marriage took place. The good missionary was able to record that all the benefits which the devout girl had anticipated really accrued.

The Chief of the Kaskaskias and his wife, says Father Gravier, ever since the marriage of their daughter with a Frenchman, have been very assiduous at the instructions and have begged me to prepare them for baptism. \* \* \* \* These two worthy Savages reflected so seriously upon all that their son-in-law and daughter told them, that without speaking of it to me, they agreed that the chief should publicly declare the resolution which he had taken to become a Christian. To make this act more solemn he gave a feast to the chiefs of all the villages and to the most notable among the Peorias, all famous jugglers; he openly renounced all their superstitions, and urged them in a rather long harangue to be no longer the enemies of their own happiness by resisting the grace of Christianity which God was offering to them through my instrumentality. \* \* \* \* The same evening, his wife gave a feast to all the women of her village to inform them also that she intended to become a Christian. \* \* \* \* From that time they urged me to baptize them. I granted them that favor after they had given me several proofs of their desire to perform the duties of Christians. To make the ceremony of their baptismal more profitable and more imposing, I proclaimed throughout the village that all were to be present at their baptism. I was very glad that many witnessed it. I took advantage of the occasion to exhort the others to imitate them.

This good Indian girl of whom it has been said it was expected by the early missionaries she would become another Rose of Lima, not only did much to lead her people to the way of salvation, but had the distinction of being the mother of the first child whose baptismal record appears upon the records remaining of the Mission of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin established by Father Marquette, after the removal to the southern part of the state.

Summing up the results of his mission, Father Gravier says:

My sins and the malice of men have not prevented God from pouring down abundant blessings on this mission of the Illinois. It has been augmented by two hundred and six souls whom I baptized between the 30th of March and 29th of November, 1693. Many children among that number are already in heaven and pray to God for their parents' conversion. Since the chief of the *Kaskaskia* has been baptized with his wife and family, consisting of fifteen persons, he blushes not for the gospel, and ceases not to exhort and instruct the young men of his village night and day. I observe, thanks be to God, that he is listened to as well as his wife, who is ever in the chapel at the head of all those of her sex.

\* \* \* \*

Pray to God, my Reverend Father, to preserve the neophyte chief, his wife, his family, and his son-in-law in their first fervor.

We have fortunately been left a graphic picture of the country near the end of Tonti's administration, which, while it does not give us some details that would be most interesting, nevertheless, supplies a very important chapter in the history of Illinois.

The distinguished Canadian Bishop De Laval who established the Seminary of Foreign Missions in Quebec, had very much at heart the evangelizing of the Indians in the interior of the country, and his successor, Bishop De St. Valier, sent three able priests ordained at the seminary down through the lakes and over Illinois. It is especially interesting to know that Tonti met these missionaries and conducted them all through Illinois and to the lower Mississippi. One of the ablest of these, Reverend John Francis Buisson de St. Cosme, wrote a very interesting account of this missionary trip, part of which, of greatest interest in Illinois, is as follows. Arriving near Chicago, the Father says:

We went by land, Mr. de Montigny, Davion and myself, to the house of the Reverend Jesuit Fathers, our people staying with the baggage. We found there Rev. Father Pinet and Rev. Father Bine-teau, who had recently come in from the Illinois and were slightly sick.

I cannot explain to you, Monseigneur, with what cordiality and marks of esteem these reverend Jesuit Fathers received and caressed us during the time that we had the consolation of staying with them. Their house is built on the banks of the small lake, having the river on one side and a fine large prairie on the other. The Indian village is of over 150 cabins, and one league on the river there is another village almost as large. They are both of the Miamis. Reverend Father

\* *Thwaites, Jesuit Relations*, Vol. LXIV, pp. 233-237.

Pinet makes it his ordinary residence except in winter, when the Indians all go hunting, and which he goes and spends at the Illinois. We saw no Indians there, they had already started for their hunt. If we may judge of the future by the little while that Father Pinet has been on this mission, we may say that God blesses the labors and zeal of this holy missionary. There will be a great number of good and fervent Christians there. It is true that little fruit is produced there in those who have grown up and hardened in debauchery, but the children are baptized and even the medicine men, most opposed to Christianity, allow their children to be baptized. They are even very glad to have them instructed. Many girls already grown up and many young boys are being instructed, so that it may be hoped that when the old stock dies off there will be a new Christian people.

On the 24th, of October, the wind having fallen, we made our canoes come with all our baggage, and perceiving that the waters were extremely low we made a cache on the shore and took only what was absolutely necessary for our voyage, reserving till spring to send for the rest, and we left in charge of it Brother Alexander, who consented to remain there with Father Pinet's man, and we started from Chicago on the 29th, and put up for the night about two leagues off, in the little river which is then lost in the prairies. The next day we began the portage, which is about three leagues long when the water is low, and only a quarter of a league in the spring, for you embark on a little lake that empties into a branch of the river of the Illinois, and when the waters are low you have to make a portage to that branch. We made half our portage that day, and we should have made some progress further, when we perceived that a little boy whom we had received from Mr. de Muys, having started on alone, although he had been told to wait, had got lost without any one paying attention to it, all hands being engaged. We were obliged to stop and look for him. All set out, we fired several guns, but could not find him. It was a very unfortunate mishap, we were pressed by the season and the waters being very low, we saw well that being obliged to carry our effects and our canoe it would take us a great while to reach the Illinois. This made us part company, Mr. de Montigny, de Tonti and Davion, continued the portage next day, and I with four other men returned to look for this little boy, and on my way back I met Fathers Pinet and Bineteau who were going with two Frenchmen and one Indian to the Illinois. We looked for him again all that day without being able to find him. As next day was the feast of All Saints this obliged me to go and pass the night at Chicago with our people, who having heard mass and performed their devotions early, we spent all that day too in looking for that little boy without being able to get the least trace. It was very difficult to find him in the tall grass, for the whole country is prairies; you meet only some clumps of woods. As the grass was high we durst not set fire to it for fear of burning him. Mr. de Montigny had told me not to stay over a day, because the cold was becoming severe; this obliged me to start after giving Brother Alexander directions to look for him and to take some of the French who were at Chicago.

I set out the second of November in the afternoon, made the portage, and slept at the river of the Illinois; we went down the river to an island. During the night we were surprised to see an inch of snow and the next day the river frozen in several places, yet we had to break the ice and drag the canoe, because there was no water; this forced us to leave our canoe and go in search of Mr. de Montigny, whom we overtook the next day, the 5th of the month, at Stag Island (*Isle aux Cerfs*). They had already made two leagues portage, and there were still four to make to Mount Joliet, which we made in three days and arrived on the 8th of the month. From *Isle a la Cache* to Mount Joliet is the space of seven leagues. You must always make a portage, there being no water in the river except in the spring. All along this river is very agreeable. It is prairies skirted by hills and very fine woods, where there are numbers of deer as well as on the river. There is abundance of game of all kinds, so that one of our men strolling around after making the portage, killed enough to give us a plentiful supper and breakfast next morning. Mount Joliet is a mound of earth in the prairie, on the right as you go down, slightly elevated, about thirty feet. The Indians say that at the time of a great deluge one of their ancestors escaped, and that this little mountain is his canoe which he turned over there. On leaving Mount Joliet we made about two leagues to another little portage of about a quarter of a league. As one of our men, named Charbonneau, had killed several turkeys and geese in the morning and a deer, we did well to give somewhat of a treat to our people and let them rest for a day.

On the 10th, we made the little portage and found half a league of water, and then two men towed the canoe for a league; the rest marched on land, each with his pack, and we embarked for the space of a league and a half and stopped for the night at a little portage, five or six arpens off.

On the 11th, after making the little portage, we came to the river Tealike, which is the real river of the Illinois; that which we had descended being only a branch. We put all our affairs in the canoe, which two men towed, while Mr. de Tonti and we with the rest of our men marched on land, always through beautiful prairies. We arrived at the village of the Panzichias Miamis who formerly dwelt on the banks of the Mississippi and who some years since came and settled in this place. There was no one in the village, all having gone out hunting. We went that day to halt near Massacre, which is a little river that empties into the river of the Illinois. It was from this day that we began to have buffalo, and the next day two of our men killed four, but as these animals are lean at this season, they contented themselves with taking the tongues. These cattle seem to me larger than ours; they have a hump on the back, the legs are very short, the head very large and so covered with long hair, that it is said a ball cannot penetrate it. We afterwards saw them almost every day during our voyage to the Arkansas.

After having had to carry our baggage for three days, and put it all together in the canoe, the river being low and full of rocks, we arrived on the 15th of November at the place called the Old Fort. It



is a rock which is on the banks of the river about a hundred feet high, where Mr. de La Salle built a fort which he abandoned. The Indians having gone to stay about twenty-five leagues lower down, we slept a league below, where we found two Indian cabins. We were consoled to see one perfectly good Christian woman.

From Chicago to the fort they reckon thirty leagues. Here navigation begins, which continues uninterrupted to the Fort of the Per-mavevvi, where the Indians are now. We arrived there on the 19th of November. We found R. Father Pinet there, who not being loaded when they started from Chicago had arrived here six or seven days before us. We also saw there Rev. Father Marest, a Jesuit. All the reverend Fathers gave us all possible welcome. Their only regret was to see us start so soon, on account of the frosts. We there took a Frenchman who had spent three years at the Akanas and who knows the language a little.

This Illinois mission seems to me the finest that Jesuit Fathers have up here, for without counting all the children who are baptized, there are many grown persons who have abandoned all their superstitions and live as perfectly good Christians, frequenting the sacraments, and are married in the church. We had not the consolation of seeing all these good Christians, for they were all dispersed going down the bank of the river to hunt. We saw there only some Indian women married to Frenchmen, who edified us by their modesty and by their assiduity in going several times a day to the chapel to pray. We sang High Mass there with deacon and subdeacon, on the day of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin, and after commending our voyage to her, and placing ourselves under her protection, we started from the Illinois.

On the 22nd of November we had to break the ice for two or three arpens to get out of the lake of Peoria. We were four canoes, Mr. de Tonti's, our two, and another (of five?) young voyageurs who chose to accompany us, partly on account of Mr. de Tonti, who is generally loved by all the voyageurs, partly also to see the country. Rev. Fathers Bineteau and Pinet also joined us for a part of the way, wishing to go and spend the whole winter with their Indians.

The first day after our departure we found the cabin of Rouenfas, the most considerable of the Illinois chiefs. He is a very good Christian and received us politely, not like a barbarian, but like a well bred Frenchman; he took us to his cabin and forced us to spend the night there. He made us a present of three deer, one of which he gave to the Father, the other to Mr. de Tonti, and the third to us. We there learned that the Charanon, the Chekaihas, the Karkinopols had surprized the Kawkias, an Illinois nation that is about five or six leagues below the mouth of the River of the Illinois along the Mississippi. They had killed ten men, taken nearly 100 slaves, as well women as children. As this Rouenfas has much talent, we thought ourselves obliged to make him some present to induce him to favor our passage through the Illinois nations, not so much for this first voyage as for the others, when we might be in less force, for all these peoples up here are much inclined and easily conceive jealousy when one goes



to other nations. We therefore gave him a belt to show him that we contracted an alliance with him, and with all his nation, and that he being a Christian should have no greater pleasure than to see other nations partake of the happiness that he enjoyed, and that to this end he was bound to facilitate as much as he could the design of the missionaries who were going to instruct them. We then made him a little present of powder.

On the 23d, in the morning, after saying our masses, where Rouenfas and his family received at Mr. de Montigny's mass, we set out and came to a little Indian village where we landed. The chief, by name the Bear, told us that it was not apropos for us to go to the Mississippi, but Mr. de Tonti gained or intimidated him by these words, telling him that we were envoys from the Master of Life, who is the king, and of the great master of the river, to instruct those Indians where we were going, and that he was spared by the Governor to accompany us, so that to give us any trouble would be to attack the Governor in person. As he made no reply to these words we embarked, and on the 24th, we went to pass the night at another village of several cabins, where we found the one called Tivet, once a famous chief in his nation, but of late abandoned by almost all his people. He made many complaints to Mr. de Tonti, who reproached him with the fact that it was his misconduct that drew on him the hatred of his people, and that he had long promised to give up his jugglery (for he is a famous medicine man), but that he had done nothing of the kind. He was afterwards there at prayers, and the Indian promised to be instructed.

The next day, March 25th, we parted with Rev. Father Pinet, who remains in this village to pass the winter, for there was a good number of praying Indians, and on the 26th, we found a village, the chief of which was hunting with all his young men. Some old men came to meet us, weeping for the death of their people defeated by the Chaoanons. They told us that we did not do well to go through the Carrechias with the Chauanons, to whom, they said, Mr. de Tonti had given arms and had attacked them. Mr. de Tonti replied that it was over three years since he left the Illinois, and that he could not have seen the Chauanons to give them arms, but as the Indians continued constantly saying many unreasonable things, we saw that they were not well disposed and that we should start as soon as possible, before the youth, who were to arrive next morning, came in. We accordingly left abruptly, Mr. de Tonti telling them that he did not fear men. They told us that they bewailed our youth, who would be killed. Mr. de Tonti replied that he could kill men. It must be avowed that the Indians have a very great esteem for him; it is enough for him to be in a party to prevent their offering any insult. We embarked at once and went to pass the night five or six leagues from this village. The next day we were detained a part of the day by reason of a great quantity of ice that was floating in the river.

On the 28th, we landed at a village where there were about twenty cabins. We there saw the chief's wife. This woman is very influential in the nation on account of her talent and liberality, and

because having many sons and sons-in-law, all hunters, she often gives banquets, which is a means of soon acquiring influence among these Indians and all their nations. We said mass in the village in the cabin of a soldier named La Violette, married to a squaw, whose child Me. de Montigny baptized. Mr. de Tonti related to this chief-tainness what they had said to us in the last village. She disapproved it all and told him that all the nation felt great joy to see him and us too, but what grieved her was not to be sure of seeing her again and possessing her longer.

We left this village and made about eight leagues. From the 29th of November to the 3d of December we were detained at the same place by the ice, by which the river was entirely blocked up. During all this time we had provisions in plenty, for one cannot fast on this river, so abundant is it in game of all kinds, swans, geese, ducks. It is skirted by very fine woods, which are not very large, so that you sometimes meet fine prairies where there are numbers of deer. Charbonneau killed several while we were detained. Others also killed some. The navigation of this river is not very good when the water is low. We were sometimes obliged to march with a part of our people while the others conducted the canoes, not without difficulty, being sometimes obliged to get into the water which was already very cold. During our delay, Father Bineteau, whom we had left at the village of the chief's wife, came to see us and after spending a day with us returned to the village for the Feast of St. Francis Xavier. On that day a high wind having broken a part of the ice we made about two leagues. The next day, having taken wooden canoes at five Indian cabins, we broke about three or four arpens of ice that blocked up the river, and was about four inches thick and bore men on it. Then we had navigation free to the Mississippi, where we arrived on the 5th of December, after having made about eight leagues from the Fort of Peniteni.

Mississippi is a large and beautiful river, that comes from the north. It divides into several channels at the part where the river of the Illinois empties, which forms very beautiful islands. It makes several bends but seems to me to keep always the same direction to the south as far as the Arkansas. It is lined by very fine forests. The bank on both sides appears about thirty feet high, which does not prevent its inundating far into the woods in the spring when the waters are high, except some hills or very elevated spots occasionally met with. You find all along great quantities of buffalo, bear, deer. You also see a very great number of birds. We always had so great a quantity of meat along this river as far as the Arkansas, that we passed several herds of buffalo without caring to fire at them.

On the 6th of December we embarked on the Mississippi. After making about six leagues we found the great river of the Missouri which comes from the west, and which is so muddy that it spoils the waters of the Mississippi, which down to this river are very clear. It is said that there are up this mountain (river?) a great number of Indians. Three or four leagues (further) we found on the left a rock having some figures painted on it, for which it is said, the Indians

have some veneration. They are now almost effaced. We went that day to Kavvehias (Cahokias), who were still mourning over the blow inflicted on them by the Chikakas and Chouanons; they all began to weep on our arrival. They did not seem to us so hostile or ill disposed as some Illinois Indians had told us of these poor people, who excited more our compassion than our fear.

The next day about noon we reached the Tamarois. The Indians had been early notified of our coming by another who had started from the Akansas to carry them the news. As they had given trouble to some of Mr. de Tonti's men a year before, they were afraid, and all the women and children fled from the village; but we did not go to it, as we wished to prepare for the feast of the Conception, we cabined on the other side of the river on the right. Mr. de Tonti went to the village and having reassured them a little, he brought us the chief who begged us to go and see him in his village. We promised to do so and next day, Feast of the Conception, after saying our Masses we went with Mr. de Tonti and seven of our men well armed. They came to receive us and took us to the chief's cabin. All the women and children were there, and we were no sooner there than the young folks and women broke in a part to be able to see us. They had never seen any Black Gown except for a few days the Rev. Father Gravier, who had paid them a visit. They gave us a meal, and we made them a little present as we had done to the Carrechias. We told them that it was to show them that we had a well made heart, and that we wished to contract an alliance with them, so that they should kindly receive our people who often passed there, and that they should give them food. They received it with many thanks and then we returned. The Tamarois were cabined on an island lower down than their village, which is on the edge of a prairie, is somewhat distant; perhaps too for fear of their enemies. We could not well see whether they were very numerous. They seemed to us quite so, although the greater part of their people were hunting. There was wherewith to form a fine mission by bringing here the Kavvehias, who are quite near, and the Michigamias, who are a little lower down on the Mississippi, and said to be quite numerous. We did not see them as they had gone inland to hunt. The three villages speak Illinois.

We left Tamarois on the 8th of December, in the afternoon. On the 10th, we saw a hill which is about three arpents distance from the Mississippi on the right hand going down. After being detained a part of the 11th, by the rain, we arrived early on the 12th, at Cape St. Antoine, where we remained that day and all the next to get pitch, which we needed. There are many pines from Cape St. Antoine to a river lower down, and it is the only spot where I saw any from Chicago to the Akansas. Cape St. Antoine is a rock on the left as you go down. Some arpents below there is another rock on the right which advances into the river, and forms an island, or rather a rock about 200 feet high, which making the river turn back very abruptly and narrowing the channel forms a kind of whirlpool there, where it is said a canoe is engulfed at the high waters. Fourteen Miamis were once lost there, which has rendered the spot fearful among the

Indians, so that they are accustomed to make some sacrifices to this rock when they pass. We saw no figure there as we had been told. You ascend this island and rock by a hill with considerable difficulty. On it we planted a beautiful cross, singing the *Vexilla Regis*, and our people fired three volleys of musketry. God grant that the cross which has never been known in these regions, may triumph there and our Lord pour forth abundantly on them the merits of His holy passion, that all the Indians may know and serve him. At Cape St. Antoine you begin to find canes. There is also a kind of large tree like the whitewood, which exuded a gum of very good odor; you find too all along the Mississippi a quantity of fruit trees unknown in Canada, the fruit of which (persimmons) is excellent. We found sometimes fruit still on the trees. I had forgotten to note here that (since) we were on the Mississippi we did not perceive that we were in winter, and the more we descended the greater heat we found, yet the nights are cool.

We left Cape St. Antoine on the 14th of December, and on the 15th, we halted for the night one league below the Wabash (Ohio), a large and beautiful river which is on the left of the Mississippi and comes from towards the north, and is they say, five hundred leagues long, and rises near the Sonontuans. They go by this river to the Chauanons, who trade with the English.

On the 16th, we started from the Wabash (Ohio), and nothing special befel us, nor did we find anything remarkable till the Arkansas, except that we found a certain bird, (pelican) as large as a swan, which has the bill about a foot long, and the throat of extraordinary size, so large in some, they say, that it would hold a bushel of wheat. The one that we took was a small one and would easily have held in his throat half a bushel. They say that this bird gets in the current, and opening his large bill (takes the fish) that thrust themselves into his gullet. Our Frenchmen call this bird Chibek. (The Grandgozier or Pelican.) On the 22nd, we found a small river on the left going down, which is said to be the road to go to the Chickashaws, who are a large nation, and it is supposed that it is not very far from this little river to their villages.

On the 24th, we cabined early so that our people might prepare for the great feast of Christmas. We made a little chapel; we sang a high Mass at midnight where our people and all the French attend their duties. Christmas day was spent in saying our Masses, all which our people heard and in the afternoon we chanted Vespers. We were greatly astonished to see the earth tremble at one o'clock in the afternoon, and although this earthquake did not last long, it was violent enough for all to perceive it easily. We started next day a little late, because we had to wait for an Indian boy that Mr. de Tonti had, who went into the woods the day before to look for fruit and got lost. We thought that he might have been taken by some Chickasas warriors, which obliged us to keep watch and ward all night, but we were quite glad to see him come back next morning. We set out and went to cabin for the night near the spot where the Kappas, a nation of the Arkansas were formerly.



On St. John's day, after making about five leagues, we saw some wooden canoes and an Indian on the water's edge; as we were near and were afraid that he would take to flight on seeing us, one of our men took the calumet and sung. He was heard at the village which was quite near; a part ran away, the others brought the calumet and came to receive us at the water's edge. They rubbed us when we came up and then rubbed themselves, a mark of esteem among the Indians. They took us on their shoulders and carried us to a chief's cabin. There was a hill of potter's clay to get up and the one that carried sank under his burden. I was afraid that he would let me fall and so I got down in spite of him and went up the hill, but as soon as I got to the top I had absolutely to get on his back and be carried to the cabin. Some time after they came to chant the Calumet for us, and the next afternoon they carried us to another cabin, where making Mr. de Tonti and us also sit down on bear skins, and four chiefs having each taken a calumet that they had placed before us, the others began to sing, striking on a kind of drum, made of earthen pots over which they place a skin; they hold in their hands a gourd with pebbles in it, which makes a noise, and then chant according with the sound of these drums, and the sound of these gourds. This makes a music which is not the most agreeable, while an Indian who was behind rocked us. We were soon disgusted with this ceremony, which they perform for all strangers, as they esteem it and you must suffer it or pass for being ill disposed and having bad designs. We put some of our people in our place after staying there a little while, and they had the pleasure of being rocked all night. The next day they made us a present of a little salve and some skins, which we repaid by another present of knives and other things that they esteem highly. We were much consoled to see ourselves in the (proposed) places of our missions, but we were sensibly afflicted to see this Akansas nation once so numerous entirely destroyed by war and sickness. It is not a month since they got over the smallpox which carried off the greatest part of them. There was nothing to be seen in the village but graves. There were two (tribes) together there and we estimated that there were not a hundred men; all the children and a great part of the women were dead. These Indians seem of very good disposition. We were every moment invited to feasts. They possess extraordinary fidelity. They transported all we had to a cabin, and it remained there for two days without anything being taken, and for ourselves there was nothing lost. One of our men having forgotten his knife in a cabin, an Indian came at once to restore it. Polygamy is not common among them. Yet we saw in the village of the Kappas one of those wretched men who from their youth dress as women, serving for the most shameful vices, but this wretch was not of their nation: he was an Illinois, among whom this is quite common. These Indians have in abundance, corn, beans, squashes. As for hunting, being crushed by sickness and in constant fear of their enemies, we saw no signs of any in their village. They cabin like the Hurons, using large earthen pots instead of kettles and well made pitchers. They are quite naked except that when they go out they throw a buffalo



robe around them. The women and girls are like the Illinois half naked; they have a skin hanging down from the waist and reaching to the knees; some have a small deer skin like a scarf.

We remained in this village two days and a half, and after planting a cross that we told them was a sign of our union, we started on the 30th of November (December?) to go to their other village which is about nine leagues from this. It was a deep regret to part with Mr. de Tonti who could not go with us for several reasons. He would much have desired to bear us company to the other nations where we were going, but business called him back to the Illinois. He is the man that best knows the country. He has been twice to the sea; he has been twice far inland to the remotest nations; he is loved and feared everywhere. If they were exploring these parts, I do not think that they can confide it to a more experienced man than he is. Your grace, Monseigneur, will, I doubt not, take pleasure in acknowledging the obligations we owe him.<sup>9</sup>

There is some confusion in the letters and reports that makes it difficult to determine just what relation the Fort St. Louis and what we now know as Starved Rock bear to the fort which is known to have existed at various times near what is now Peoria. It is certain that both the Indians and French passed up and down between those points without considering the journey of much moment. Sometimes we read of a missionary or inhabitant of one place being at the other, and at one time the fort at Peoria is garrisoned and at another time deserted. But at The Rock "the military occupation of Illinois seems to have continued without interruption from the time when La Salle returned from Ft. Frontenac" down to 1699 or 1700 when the fort was discontinued by order of the French government, and La Forest was directed to return to Canada and Tonti ordered to join D'Iberville on the Mississippi river.

The secret of Tonti's removal to the lower Mississippi did not lie alone in the erroneous policy of the French government in abandoning the forts in and near Illinois, but more in the fact that the settlement and development of the lower Mississippi was urgent. Tonti had been the first to point out that it was unsafe to leave the lower Mississippi open and thus expose the interior of the country to conquest by the English who were pushing their claims to the West. And although the government turned a deaf ear to many of Tonti's suggestions, it nevertheless gave heed to this warning of English aggression and sent De Iberville to protect the mouth of the Mississippi river, and it was to assist him that Tonti was ordered South.

<sup>9</sup> Shea, *Early Mississippi Voyages*, pp. 52-73.

<sup>10</sup> Bancroft, *History of the United States*, Vol. III, p. 195.

The few years that he spent with the colony at Biloxi constitute another interesting story which is not directly connected with the story of Illinois. The reader will contemplate with grief, however, this bold pioneer's fate. In an epidemic of yellow fever Tonti spent himself nursing the afflicted, and finally contracted the contagion from which he died. But no man knows his grave. He played a part of vast importance in this life, measuring up to every duty and responsibility without worldly recompense and went to an unknown grave.

JOSEPH J. THOMPSON.

Chicago.

## TWO NOTABLE EVENTS IN CHICAGO ARCHDIOCESE

INSTALLATION OF RT. REV. E. F. HOBAN AS BISHOP OF ROCKFORD, AND  
CONSECRATION OF RT. REV. B. J. SHEIL AS AUXILIARY  
BISHOP OF CHICAGO

Two events of recent months served to make the Chicago archdiocese the center of ecclesiastical interest. One was the appointment of the Rt. Rev. Edward F. Hoban, D.D., as bishop of Rockford and his installation in his episcopal city. The other was the selection of the Rt. Rev. Bernard J. Sheil, D.D., one of the youngest prelates in the United States, as auxiliary bishop of Chicago and his consecration in Holy Name Cathedral.

It is coincident that Bishop Hoban as the successor of the Rt. Rev. P. J. Muldoon, D.D., first Bishop of Rockford, was selected by the Holy Father from the same post as his predecessor. It was 20 years ago that Bishop Muldoon went to Rockford, chosen to preside over that newly-formed see.

The Rt. Rev. Bishop Hoban, like Bishop Sheil, is a native Chicagoan, born near the corner of Noble street. He received his early education under the Sisters at St. Columbkille's school, later attending St. Ignatius College. His studies for the priesthood were pursued at St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore. He was ordained July 11, 1903, by the Most Reverend J. E. Quigley, late archbishop of Chicago in the Cathedral of the Holy Name. For a brief period he served as assistant at St. Agnes church and later was chosen with other young priests to be sent to Rome to prepare for a place on the faculty of Quigley Preparatory Seminary, then in plan by Archbishop Quigley. While there he received the degree Doctor of Divinity.

Upon his return to Chicago he was named assistant chancellor in addition to his duties on the faculty of Quigley. In January, 1910, on the selection of Bishop E. M. Dunne, then chancellor to the bishopric of Peoria, Bishop Hoban was named chancellor of the Chicago archdiocese. Other honors followed for this gifted young churchman. In 1917, at the instance of Cardinal Mundelein, then archbishop, he was raised to the dignity of a privy chamberlain with the title of monsignor. His ability and unusual qualities of mind and heart brought his next honor—that of auxiliary bishop of Chicago, titular bishop of Colonia, a former episcopal see in Armenia. His

consecration was marked by a scene of unusual and brilliant splendor at the Cathedral of the Holy Name. Archbishop Mundelein performed the ceremony with Bishop McGavick of La Crosse and Bishop Molloy of Brooklyn as co-consecrators. Again he was singled out for distinction in being named vicar general of the archdiocese, succeeding the Rt. Rev. M. J. FitzSimmons, rector of the Cathedral of the Holy Name, who retired with the title Vicar General Emeritus.

Many lines of church endeavor have known the leadership and advice of Bishop Hoban during his years of service in the Chicago archdiocese. Outstanding was his successful direction of the 28th International Eucharistic Congress of which Cardinal Mundelein chosen him as the honorary president. The multitudinous tasks that fell to his hands were dispatched with tact and efficiency. While his greatest field of service was in connection with the affairs of the chancery office, one of the largest in the world, his work and guidance extended into many other avenues. As spiritual director of the Holy Name society his abilities were tested and proved. His interest in the boys work was paramount and he was the guiding spirit in the Holy Name Technical School project. Regret was keen that his appointment to Rockford called him away from this important work so well started. The Catholic Salvage Bureau, another branch of the Holy Name society's work claimed his support and the Catholic Charities of Chicago, a work of far-reaching influence for good, felt his practical aid and zeal.

The installation of Bishop Hoban at St. James pro Cathedral, Rockford, took place Tuesday, May 15th. Cardinal Mundelein with 28 Bishops led the escort party to Rockford. A special train carried the church dignitaries, 250 clergy, laymen and relatives of the new Rockford prelate. At Rockford a civic welcome from the mayor awaited him.

Cardinal Mundelein officiated at the installation at St. James pro cathedral. The address of welcome was given by the Very Rev. F. F. Connor, J.C.L., administrator of the Rockford diocese. The papal Bulls were read by the Rev. Charles F. Conley, Ph.D., pastor St. Mary's Church, Freeport, who acted as notary. Solemn Mass was celebrated Coram Episcopo with Cardinal Mundelein and Bishop Hoban occupying thrones in the sanctuary. Officers of the Mass were: Rev. David J. Conway, Woodstock, celebrant; Rev. J. J. Flanagan, rector St. James pro Cathedral Rockford, deacon; Rev. M. A. Schumacher, Aurora, sub deacon; Rev. Joseph M. Egan, Freeport, thurifer, and Rev. James Tuomey, Woodstock, and Rev. Arthur Schmid, Harvard, acolytes. Rev. Joseph Morrison, Rev. Francis A. Ryan,

Rev. F. J. Conron, Rev. F. J. Keenan and Rev. J. M. Tully, masters of ceremonies Rev. A. J. Burns, S.T.L., was assistant priest and Rev. J. P. McGuire and Rev. A. A. Heinzler, deacons of honor to Cardinal Mundelein. Rev. Ronald French, Cross bearer; Rev. John J. Laffey, book bearer; Rev. E. A. O'Brien, candle bearer; Rev. Michael Foley and Rev. C. S. Nix, deacons of honor to Bishop Hoban. The massed choirs of Rockford churches were directed by Rev. William V. Reedy of Peatonica.

At a farewell testimonial for Bishop Hoban on the eve of his departure for Rockford, hundreds of clergy paid a glowing tribute to his lordship and presented him a purse of money.

#### BISHOP SHEIL

The appointment of the Rt. Rev. Bernard J. Sheil as auxiliary bishop of Chicago, gave recognition to one of the youngest and most untiring workers among the clergy of the Archdiocese of Chicago. Catholics of Chicago were agreeably surprised March 31 of this year when official announcement of the appointment of the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Sheil, LL.D., as auxiliary bishop to His Eminence Cardinal Mundelein was made by His Holiness, Pope Pius XI. The news dispatches from Rome were immediately verified by His Eminence Cardinal Mundelein on his arrival in Chicago from New York, several hours in advance of the newly appointed bishop. Msgr. Sheil, who, with the Rt. Rev. Msgr. H. F. Wolf, had accompanied His Eminence Cardinal Mundelein to Rome, had just begun the last stage of his homeward journey when the announcement was made of his appointment as titular Bishop of Pege and Auxiliary to Cardinal Mundelein.

Bishop Sheil was born within the boundaries of St. Columbkille's parish in 1888, the son of Mr. and Mrs. James B. Sheil. He was educated at St. Viator College and Seminary and was ordained priest at the Cathedral of the Holy Name in 1910. Appointed first to St. Mel's parish, his service there endeared him to hundreds of parishioners. During the World War, Monsignor Sheil was appointed chaplain at the Great Lakes Naval Training station. His tireless work on behalf of the country's service men won him high commendation particularly during the influenza epidemic.

At the conclusion of the war, Bishop Sheil was appointed to Holy Name Cathedral parish. In 1924 he was named as assistant chancellor and the same year accompanied his Eminence Cardinal Mundelein to Rome where he was present at the ceremonies at which Cardinal Mundelein was raised to the Sacred College of Cardinals.



While in Rome, Monsignor Sheil was made private chamberlain to His Holiness.

Msgr. Sheil was prominently identified in planning and carrying out the 28th International Eucharistic Congress held here in 1926, having been elected by His Eminence for the office of Treasurer of the Congress.

Another instance of Bishop Sheil's ability was demonstrated when at Cardinal Mundelein's suggestion he was named a domestic prelate with the title of Right Reverend Monsignor.

His consecration as auxiliary bishop of Chicago took place Tuesday, May 1st, at the Cathedral of the Holy Name, Cardinal Mundelein officiating. It was a colorful ceremony attended with all the pomp and ritual of the Church. Led by Cardinal Mundelein a vast and distinguished concourse of prelates, priests and laymen assembled for the exercises. His Eminence was assisted by the Rt. Rev. E. M. Dunne and the Rt. Rev. E. F. Hoban, as co-consecrators. The Rev. Robert C. Maguire, chancellor as notary, read the papal bull authorizing the consecration.

The mass was celebrated by His Eminence, Cardinal Mundelein, who pontificated at the main altar while the Bishop-elect celebrated simultaneously in the chapel on the epistle side of the sanctuary. The officers of the Mass of Consecration were: Deacon of honor, Right Rev. Msgr. T. P. Bona; deacon of honor, Rt. Rev. Msgr. P. J. McDonnell; deacon of Mass, Very Rev. Msgr. James Horsburgh; subdeacon of Mass, Rev. P. C. Conway; master of ceremonies, Rt. Rev. Msgr. D. J. Dunne; assistant master of ceremonies, Rev. F. A. Ryan; assistant master of ceremonies, Rev. Joseph P. Morrison; cross bearer, Rev. Frank O. McCarthy; notary, Rev. R. C. Maguire; mitre bearer, Rev. M. L. Nealis; crozier bearer, Rev. William Keefe, Indianapolis, Ind.; Knight of St. Gregory, Mr. Joe W. McCarthy; Minister of Faldstool, Rev. J. L. O'Donnell; acolytes, Rev. T. Canty, Rev. S. O'Connor; thurifer, Rev. John E. Foley; boat bearer, Rev. William A. Murphy; bugia-bearer, Rev. John J. O'Hearn; chaplains to Bishop Dunne, Very Rev. Msgr. V. Primeau, Very Rev. Msgr. V. Blahunke; Chaplains to Bishop Hoban, Rt. Rev. Msgr. C. J. Quille, Rt. Rev. Msgr. H. F. Wolf; chaplains to Bishop-elect Sheil, Rev. J. F. Ryan, C. S. V.; Rev. T. J. McDevitt, LL.D.; mitre bearer, Rev. J. P. O'Mahoney, C. S. V.; ring bearer, Rev. S. Sullivan; biretta bearer, Rev. William Casey; master of ceremonies, Rev. Joseph P. Morrison; minister of book, Rev. William J. Lynch; priests for procession, Rev. James Halleran, D.D.; Rev. D. F. Cunningham, Rev. W. J. Gorman; Rev. G. J. Cloos, Rev.

F. J. Gillespie, Rev. L. Peschon, Rev. T. J. Hayes, Rev. A. Przypszny; four priests for vestments, Rev. P. B. Smith, Rev. J. Tully, Rev. C. Schroeder, Rev. R. Berneau.

The Assistant Priest was the Rt. Rev. Msgr. John F. Ryan. The Rt. Rev. M. J. FitzSimmons, V.G.E., is rector of the Cathedral.

Gift bearers: Very Rev. A. Pelletier, S.S.S.; Rev. Michael Cavallo; Rev. John Plaznik; Rev. Thomas J. Bobal; Rev. Stanislaus V. Bona; Rev. H. J. Vaicunas.

The sermon was preached by the Rev. William J. Bergin, C.S.V., of St. Viator College, Bourbonnais, a former instructor of the new prelate. Many alumni from St. Viator's, Bishop Sheil's alma mater, were present.

About 1,000 attended the banquet which followed at the Drake Hotel. The Rev. Stephen E. McMahon was toastmaster and the speakers were Cardinal Mundelein, Bishop McGavick, Bishop Hoban, Rev. J. A. McCarthu and Bishop Sheil. The honored guest was presented a purse of \$36,165.

GERTRUDE A. KRAY.

*Chicago.*

# THE STORY OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH INTERNATIONAL EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS

## A REVIEW

“When the stream  
Which overflowed the soul was passed away,  
A consciousness remained that it had left,  
Deposited upon the silent shore  
Of memory, images and precious thoughts,  
That shall not die, and cannot be destroyed.”

—Wordsworth.

Whoever attended the Eucharistic Congress that was held in Chicago two years ago and witnessed that marvelous demonstration of Catholic faith and worship will cherish to his dying day the “images and precious thoughts” engraved on his soul during those days of sublime and touching festivities. And those who were not privileged to participate in the great event, in their soul too has ever since

“A consciousness remained that it had left,”

after their more fortunate friends and acquaintances returned home and described again and again what their eyes had seen and what their hearts had felt. In very truth, the remembrance of the Eucharistic Congress in Chicago is a treasure

“That shall not die, and cannot be destroyed.”

To what all without exception have been looking forward, however, was the official record of those unforgettable days. At last this record has been published in a handsome volume comprising more than five hundred pages and bearing the attractive title, *The Story of the Twenty-Eighth International Eucharistic Congress*. As promised in the Foreword, “the Reverend C. F. Donovan, the compiler of this work, gives an accurate and interesting account of all the assemblies, addresses and ceremonies that were part of this great event . . . . This book contains the story of the greatest religious assembly ever held in the United States. . . . For the hundreds of thousands of people privileged to be present, the glory of the Catholic Church shown in its richest ceremonial. The word paintings of the author convey in some measure an idea of the awe-inspiring scenes of these gigantic gatherings.”

To collect the vast amount of material for *The Story*, to sift and arrange this material properly, and to relate the events in a manner

that would hold the interest of the reader—this called for considerable skill, much thought, and indefatigable labor. But Father Donovan, to whom the Committee had entrusted the work, has proved himself equal to the difficult task. The material is well selected and excellently arranged, and the narrative, especially in the first thirteen chapters, is highly fascinating. Unfavorable circumstances prevented the present reviewer from taking part in the Congress. But for the deprivation of this privilege there was rich compensation in the reading of this excellent account. Vividness in the recital of events and in the portrayal of scenes not only rivets the attention and hold the interest of the reader, but it at the same time evokes in his soul a spark of that fervor and enthusiasm which the grandeur of the occasion must have awakened in the souls of the participants. Father Donovan deserves high praise for having so worthily perpetuated the memory of the glorious event. Credit is likewise due him in that he acknowledges his own and the Committee's indebtedness to Mr. Joseph I. Breen, who as director of publicity for the Congress had outlined the general plan of the volume, but who on account of illness was not able to complete the work.

As already indicated, *The Story* opens with an introductory chapter on the "Preparation for the Congress." Here we learn that it was His Eminence, George Cardinal Mundelein, Archbishop of Chicago, at whose request the International Committee in 1924 decided to hold the next International Eucharistic Congress in the Garden City on the shores of Lake Michigan. As shown in this chapter, the success of the huge undertaking must be ascribed in largest measure to the enthusiastic co-operation that manifested itself on all sides.

Having been told how much time and labor it cost to make the necessary preparations, the reader is taken in Chapters II and III to New York in order to witness the arrival of the Papal Legate, His Eminence, John Cardinal Bonzano, and to take part in the cordial reception that was tendered the Cardinal by the people of that city. Then follows in Chapter IV an interesting and stirring account of "The Journey of the Red Train" that carried the Papal Legate and his entourage from New York across the country for a thousand miles to Chicago. What the author tells us regarding the welcome which the cities and towns along the route extended to the distinguished visitors fully corroborates his own statement; namely, that this journey "was a triumph, unique in the history of any nation and a demonstration of American courtesy, hospitality and good-will in which the country may well take a justifiable pride."

Equally, if not even more, enthusiastic and inspiring was the trib-

ute of welcome that greeted the Papal Legate on his arrival in Chicago and during the civic reception given him in the spacious Coliseum. These two events are well described in Chapters V and VI. It was at the civic reception that the Hon. James J. Davis, Secretary of Labor in the Presidential Cabinet, after reading the fine letter which the President of the United States had addressed to Cardinal Mundelein for the occasion, spoke to the vast audience on his own behalf, declaring in forceful and unmistakable terms exactly where every true American stands on the religious question. No wonder there was prolonged applause when he concluded with the powerful statement:

The narrow prejudice and the intolerance of another day have vanished like mist before the morning sun. You have found, and I hope will always find, in America—no matter what conditions may prevail in other sections of this hemisphere—the freedom which you require to teach your faith to young and old and to be missionaries to us all.

And what a thrilling scene it must have been when, the Cardinal Legate, having finished his discourse, “the great crowd rose again to its feet, whereupon the orchestra struck up ‘The Star-Spangled Banner,’ in the singing of which Cardinal Bonzano and a large number of the prelates on the platform with him, joined.”

Such was the public tribute paid Cardinal Bonzano as the official representative of Pope Pius X, from the moment he set foot on the soil of the United States in New York to the moment he left the Coliseum in Chicago and repaired to the residence of the Cardinal-Archbishop. This was the first time in the history of the United States that a Papal Legate was sent to this country from Rome. In point of reverent enthusiasm and patriotic display, the welcome extended by our citizens of every race, color, and creed to the representative of the Holy Father will without doubt remain unsurpassed for many years to come.

With the formal reception in the Coliseum the secular phase of the Congress came to an end. It is a striking feature of *The Story* and cannot escape the notice of the thoughtful reader that from now on in the account even the highest Church dignitaries recede to the background, making way for Him who was presently to leave His narrow prison of the tabernacle and, as once on the streets of Jerusalem, to receive the homage and adoration of His people. Henceforth, during the five days of unceasing hosannas, the eyes and hearts of all were centered on Jesus Christ, the Son of God, living in the Blessed Eucharist for the consolation and the salvation of His people. In His honor, and in His honor alone, had the countless multitudes come to Chicago from every quarter of the globe.



Before entering upon the narrative of these exclusively religious demonstrations, the author prepares his readers for them in Chapter VII on "The Locale of the Congress." This chapter is a general survey, describing the various places where the main events of the Congress were enacted and offering at the same time a sort of programme of the ceremonies for each day.

Then follow ten intensely fascinating chapters narrating the events and ceremonies. These are grouped under two heads, viz.: the five mass gatherings at which public homage was paid to the Sacrament of the Altar and the sectional meetings where papers were read and discussions held on topics concerning the Blessed Eucharist. Chapter VIII relates the gorgeous festivities that marked the formal opening of the Congress in the Cathedral of the Holy Name. Thereupon in as many chapters the reader is treated to thrilling portrayals of the four open-air celebrations in Soldier Field, viz.: Children's Day, Women's Day, Men's Night, and Higher Education Day. It would be impossible to decide which of these four gigantic demonstrations bear the palm for glowing enthusiasm, solemn grandeur, and touching devotion—whether the 60,000 school children uniting their voices into a mighty chorus and rendering the beautiful Mass of the Angels; or the vast concourse of 250,000 women giving vent to their religious fervor in song and prayer; or the overpowering spectacle of 225,000 men kneeling beneath the starry sky, holding lighted candles, and bending their heads in silent adoration; or the colorful army of thousands of boys and girls, gathered together from the numerous institutions of learning in and near Chicago and raising their hearts to Him "who gives joy unto youth." As just stated, which of these four impressive demonstrations of Catholicity in the United States bears the palm no one would be able, nor willing, to decide. About which, however, there can be no doubt is the verdict that the climax of all the elaborate festivities was the Eucharistic Procession held on the spacious grounds of St. Mary of the Lake Seminary at Mundelein. This event—without question the grandest religious solemnity ever enacted in this country—is related in Chapter XIII. It is perhaps in telling this part of the story that the author is at his best. The manner in which he recounts the event and describes the scenes of this ever memorable 24th day of June, 1926, inclines one to the opinion that this is the finest chapter in the volume, just as the event itself was doubtlessly the climax of the entire Congress.

The remaining chapters, if not the most fascinating, are certainly the most valuable. After depicting in Chapter XIV "The Spirit of

the Congress," the author proceeds to relate what transpired at the various sectional meetings. To these he devotes Chapters XV, XVI and XVII, confining himself for detailed accounts to the English-speaking groups that assembled in the Coliseum. The author did his fellow priests a real service by printing in full the important papers and addresses given at these meetings, since taken together they form a veritable storehouse of Eucharistic lore. Here will be found, as stated in the Foreword, "many thorough discourses on the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrament of the Altar," prepared "by learned men of every nation," who "were selected because of their learning, their piety, and their remarkable ability of expressing their intimate and devotional study of Our Divine Savior and the Sacrament of His Love."

Chapter XVIII gives an account of the religious exhibits prepared for the congressists at the Municipal Pier and also of the non-Eucharistic meetings that different Catholic organizations held in connection with the Congress. How cordially the Fox Film Corporation co-operated with the ecclesiastical authorities is told in Chapter XIX. The result of this co-operation was the impressive motion picture which made it possible to carry in living pictures the story of the Congress to all parts of the world and at the same time to preserve it for the edification and inspiration of generations to come.

Very appropriately the final chapter describes the touching scenes that attended the departure of the Papal Legate and prints in full the equally touching letter which Pope Pius X addressed to Cardinal Mundelein under date of August 7, 1926. After summarizing the report which Cardinal Bonzano made to His Holiness and congratulating the Cardinal-Archbishop and the Catholics of Chicago and elsewhere on the grand success of the Congress, the Holy Father makes this appreciative and significant statement:

Nor should we pass over in silence, at this time, the deferential attitude of the public authorities and of the American press, which showed so intense and such kindly interest in this religious celebration thus nobly interpreting and satisfying the wish of the American people; of that people who was so hospitable and so generously respectful to Our representative and to the other princes and prelates of the Church, and showed such reverence for all that pertains to Religion; God certainly will not fail to bless a nation that encourages such noble sentiments and knows so well how to nobly express them. Indeed, we may consider one of the first of these blessings the admiration and praise for the United States that the Congressists returning from Chicago are even now giving expression to throughout the world.

To show the effect that the Eucharistic Congress had, the author presents a symposium of public utterances by prominent Americans, non-Catholic as well as Catholic. The last pages of the volume are devoted to a valuable bibliography of works on the Holy Eucharist and to a very serviceable List of Contents.

Fully in keeping with the contents of the volume is its attractive and durable binding. The front cover is enriched with a gold-embossed picture of the monstrance. The famous masterpiece of Da Vinci, representing the Last Supper, forms the frontispiece. The text is richly and handsomely illustrated. There are sepia portraits of Pope Pius X, of Cardinal Bonzano, and of Cardinal Mundelein; likewise of the other Cardinals who attended the Congress and of distinguished priests and laymen who by their hearty co-operation helped to make the Congress a success. In addition, there are numerous pictures of interesting scenes and events, chief among which are of course the two beautiful folding pictures in sepia, giving panoramic views of the vast concourse in Soldier Field on Children's Day and of the gathering before the chapel of St. Mary of the Lake Seminary. The illustrations are well selected and add greatly to the value of the volume. *The Story* is published by The Eucharistic Congress Committee and may be had from J. H. Meier, 64 W. Randolph St., Chicago, Ill.

To all who desire an authentic and interesting account of the great event that took place in Chicago two years ago we heartily recommend *The Story of the Twenty-Eighth International Eucharistic Congress*. While reading this wonderful story and gazing at the many beautiful pictures, one's soul will surely experience again those sentiments of love and loyalty to our Eucharistic Lord that thrilled the souls of so many thousands during the great Congress of 1926. To read this splendidly written record is to feel once more the magic spell of that unforgettable event and to realize that

"When the stream  
Which overflowed the soul was passed away,  
A consciousness remained that it had left,  
Deposited upon the silent shore  
Of memory, images and precious thoughts,  
That shall not die, and cannot be destroyed."

FRANCIS BORGIA STECK, O. F. M., Ph. D.

Quincy College